THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXXVII, No. 2 APRIL, 1930

Preaching the Spiritual Sense
LEWIS FIELD HITE 129

The Old Testament in the Critics' Den
BENJAMIN A. WHITTEMORE 143

"How Long Halt Ye Between Two Opinions?"
ANITA S. DOLE 170

Swedenborg's Influence in America to 1830
CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D. 188

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Problem of Young People LEWIS F. HITE - - - 208
The Educated Man and the New Church WILLIAM F. WUNSCH 216
The Mind of the New Church WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - 220

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

"And Yet Without Sin" EVERETT K. BRAY - - - - 225
The Soul's "King of the Jews" CHARLES W. HARVEY - - 232

Current Literature :

The Defeat of the "Higher Criticism": Harold M. Wiener's works; "The Aftermath Series"; Robert Dick Wilson's "A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament"; John L. Campbell's "The Bible Under Fire"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - 239

S. Angus' "The Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World"
AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D. - - - - - - - - 247

John Baillie's "The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity" FREDERICK M. BILLINGS - - - - 250

James K. McClure's "The Supreme Book of Mankind"
JEDEDIAH EDGERTON - - - - - - - - - 254

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—*President*, Rev. Paul Sperry, 1824 Park Road, Washington, D. C.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1223 Commercial Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVII.] APRIL, 1930 [No. 2

PREACHING THE SPIRITUAL SENSE

BY THE REV. LEWIS FIELD HITE

THE importance of this subject is obvious upon the reflection that it is the crowning work of the New Church to preach the spiritual sense. The spiritual sense of the Bible has been known and used in some measure presumably ever since men have had the Bible, and it is this that has made it the supremely important book in the world; but the systematic doctrine of the spiritual sense is new, and it is destined to make the face of Christianity new.

Our teaching is that the Bible, or that part of it which is the Word of the Lord, has a distinct and connected spiritual meaning from Genesis to Revelation. The spiritual meaning is different from the literal, and is in fact that which makes the letter to be the Word of the Lord. This spiritual meaning is within and above the letter, and points to an entirely different level of experience from that of the letter.

The spiritual meaning in its highest sense is truth about the Lord's Divine Humanity, about the glorification of the Lord's human nature, about the union of this human nature with the indwelling Divine. In a lower sense, it is truth about the life of heaven, about spiritual life in the religious meaning of the word "spiritual," about the life of heaven not only in the spiritual world but in the human race on earth.

In this general form, the teaching is new and the idea is

rather startling; but in some specific forms the teaching is at once more familiar and more baffling. The Lord says: "For their sakes I sanctify myself"; He also says: "Ye must be born again." This is familiar enough, but when we undertake to develop the meaning of these sayings, and come to the details of the concrete life involved, we inevitably find ourselves in peculiar embarrassment; it is that we seem by the very nature of the case to be confined within the limits of our own experience. Here question and doubt may arise.

If we as preachers cannot transcend our experience in our efforts to arrive at the spiritual meaning of a text, and if our hearers are likewise limited to their experience in the effort to understand what we get and try to give, we may seriously raise the question, What is the use of a man who has little or no spiritual experience trying to get and preach the spiritual sense, and what is the use of preaching the spiritual sense to a congregation which has little or no spiritual experience? Can it be done in such a way as to promote spiritual growth, raise the congregation from the natural to the spiritual level? Suppose one should get the full, clear spiritual meaning of a text, and put it in the language of a sermon, whether spoken or written, would it be received by the congregation? In other words, would it be an effective sermon, would it stir their emotions and elevate their thoughts in such a way as to make a change in their practical life? Such questions lead to serious reflection upon the nature of our task, and point to difficulties which we must overcome if we are to preach the spiritual sense with profit to the thought and life of people. This means that we must understand our task, and devise methods for performing it in the best way possible.

The nature of the task is involved in the relation of the letter of the Bible to its spiritual meaning; it is the task of interpreting the symbols of the letter in terms of the facts and states of spiritual life. But the facts and states of spiritual life must for us here and now find expression in our natural life, in the deeds and conduct of every day.

Accordingly, our method must be to begin with the letter and the natural meaning of the letter, and then rise as high as we can into the spirit, and return again to the situations of daily life. Is not this recognizing the principle that all power lies in ultimates?

According to our doctrine, that part of the Bible which has a connected and complete spiritual meaning is inmostly and primarily about the Lord alone, and outwardly and secondarily about man's relation to the Lord. This gives to the Lord's Word its unity; it also gives it the character of a spiritual history of mankind from the beginning. But the Bible in its letter is the story of the Hebrew race down to the dispersion. On the higher level it is the spiritual history of mankind written in the language of the correspondence established between the persons and events of the narrative and the spiritual life of men. It is this fact and law of correspondence that enables us to get systematic knowledge of the spiritual sense.

In view of these principles, let us descend to particulars that we may realize what the preaching of the spiritual sense involves. The Story of Creation, of Eden, of the Flood, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of the Children of Israel,—all this is a connected whole which describes by correspondence the spiritual life of man, and the Divine Human life of the Lord. This implies to our endless difficulty that every particular of the story refers to some definite spiritual state or change of state in man. If we undertake to get the spiritual meaning of these particulars, we soon find that we are entering a field of amazing psychological and spiritual complexity. Swedenborg, after giving some of the spiritual meaning of the first chapter of Genesis, says: "The Arcana contained therein are so many that volumes of books would not be sufficient to contain their explication. What are here explained are comparatively few." In fact, it may be said that Swedenborg usually gives the spiritual meaning in a very general way, and leaves to us the task of working out the details. Whether by design or from practical necessity,

Swedenborg's method gives us little more than the start in education we need. Education means appropriation, expansion, and advance to ever higher and fuller life of thought, feeling, and deed. We are told, as the next step of progress in spiritual meaning from general to particular, that Abraham represents the celestial, Isaac the spiritual, and Jacob the natural; and these terms, when applied to the developing man, mean respectively the spiritual qualities of childhood, youth, and manhood; the characteristics of these stages are taken to be affection, thought, and practical effort and achievement.

We might ask at this point how it is that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob stand for these stages of man's development from infancy to maturity, and for the stages of a progressive religious life. It will not suffice to say that their lives were divinely ordered with this representative character in view, unless we add, ordered in such a way as not to affect their freedom. If we suppose them to have been specially endowed and to have had special opportunities, we must go on to show how these resulted in giving them this character. This would seem to require that we should look into their lives and note the characteristics that distinguish them and make them representative. We may, then, ask, Did they acquire these characteristics in the free course of their development, or were they under special Divine guidance and enlightenment? In either case they were in no way different in this respect from countless other individuals of their day; for we are all under special Divine guidance and enlightenment to the extent that we seek to be guided and enlightened by the Lord's Providence. We are all dependent upon the Lord for our creation, for our preservation, and for our success in the pursuit of usefulness and happiness. The details of our lives are determined in one way by the responses we make to the influences of the environment; in this response we exercise many degrees and varieties of choice—choice as to the particulars of the environment we respond to, choice as to the manner of responding, and

choice as to motive and purpose. In general, the choice is determined by, is the expression of, the state of feeling, or as Swedenborg would say the state of love, which is present and dominant at the moment. In this way, all the details of our life lead back to states of feeling as the source. These states of feeling correspond to and are finite expressions of states of Divine Love which is the ultimate source. This establishes a relation between the details of our life and the Divine Love, or the Lord. All human life has this significance. In other words, there is always the relation of correspondence, direct or indirect, between the states of man's love and the states of the Divine Love; and there is the further correspondence between the states of man's love and the forms in which that love is expressed in the details of life. This is true of every human life; it is also true of human groups, of organizations, races, etc.

Wherein, then, lies the difference between the correspondential, or representative, character of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and that of men in general? In any and every case, a man's life has significance and representative character according to the purpose of the life and according to the circumstances and the conduct of the life. In the case of the patriarchs, we have peculiar circumstances and mode of life, the peculiar functions they performed. These, though having their general significance and representative character, acquire a special character by virtue of the fact that the Lord could and did use them as correspondential means of embodying and conveying Divine and spiritual truth to men for all time. It was the Lord's use of them for this purpose that gave them their special representative character.

The problem of the spiritual sense comes home to us in our effort to see, or to learn, what special use the Lord made of the person and his life to convey the definite truth intended. We appreciate this problem when we come to the task of learning and using the fact and law of correspondence to pass from the details of outer life to the spiritual states represented; or, what is still more difficult, to pass

from abstract statements of the spiritual meaning to the details.

Let us undertake to do this in the case of the patriarchs. We must begin with the background of Bible lands and Bible nations or races. The lands involved are Assyria, Canaan, and Egypt. The Assyrian empire was the impressive example in antiquity of a consolidated and systematized political and social organization. The formation of this empire was the result of systematic thinking and action on an extraordinarily comprehensive scale. In other words, it was the work of the rational faculty of man in the field of political and social conduct. Here we have a matter of fact correspondence between the natural rational faculty and the Assyrian empire which was its product; the correspondence is between the systematic order of thought on the one hand and the systematic order of political and social conduct on the other. The Lord made use of this relation to establish the correspondence between His thought and the letter of the Bible; in this case, the story of the patriarchs.

Egypt was reputed in ancient times to be the world's great store-house of knowledge, and in this way became the symbol of knowledge, what we now call scientific knowledge. So in the letter of the Bible it corresponds to such knowledge. Canaan, as the land of promise and of the Lord's chosen people Israel, has for ages been taken to represent man's spiritual life and the life of heaven. On the basis of this significance, the Bible lands enter our story and help us to understand the spiritual meaning.

We are reminded here that the whole story of Abraham involves successively Assyria, Canaan, and Egypt. His departure from Haran has Canaan in view. His journey from Canaan to Egypt and return brought Egypt into the story with characteristic and important significance. Haran was situated in the upper Euphrates valley, not far from the Syrian border. Abraham with his father and family had come to Haran from Ur of the Chaldees, and we must fix the correspondential significance of these places in order to

have the background of Abraham's representative character. Ur and Haran were places in the empires of Babylonia and Assyria respectively. These empires were ruled by the principle of the love of dominion, and consequently represented perverted affectional and intellectual life. In religion the people were idolators. Abraham and Terah, his father, were idolators; but according to the correspondential meaning of the Bible story, the course of idolatry through their ancestral line had been from more interior to more exterior forms, so that Abraham was in the last stage of external idolatry, which allowed no further development. Haran was the place of Abraham's sojourn after leaving his native land, Ur of the Chaldees. This connects the two places in the story and also their spiritual meaning. They were both idolatrous communities, and as such they not only represented stages of idolatry and of perverted religion, but they lived a purely external life, what Swedenborg calls "corporeal and worldly" life, a life of merely bodily and wordly interests.

With this background we are helped to see that Abraham was in the last stage of simple, external idolatry, a purely external state of mind, without inner religious perversions. His idols were themselves objects of worship, with no thought of their representative significance. His religion was purely external and formal, and his ordinary life was entirely concerned with bodily wants, domestic and pastoral cares, and social interests. He had, of course, hereditary tendencies and habits, with feelings and thoughts developed out of contact with his situation and surroundings, but with no trace of the interior perversions that characterized his ancestral line. Under these circumstances, he was in a state of mind quite separated from the religion of his ancestors, and was therefore a fitting subject for the beginning of a new development.

As is obvious from the narrative, Abraham was a strong, simple-hearted man, capable of steadfast faith and obedience; he was naturally adapted to the place he was

called to fill. His Call was in line with the original purpose to go to Canaan. Without opposing prepossessions, he was disposed to obey the Call and to pursue the course laid out for him. He set out from Haran, and after reaching Canaan, went by stages through the land to Bethel, where he built an altar unto the Lord.

So much for the literal story. According to our doctrine of correspondences, the persons, places, and events of this journey have a spiritual meaning; that is, they represent spiritual states and events. We begin with the summary interpretation given us by Swedenborg, and pass to details by making use of the law of correspondence. The language of the Call is: "And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy native land, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, to the land that I will show thee" (Gen. xii. 1). We have already considered the circumstances which gave Abram his representative character. This language of the Call adds a new feature, namely, the Lord's special use of him for His special purpose. It established a unique relation between the Lord and Abram, and made Abram His special instrument for beginning a new type of religion, a new kind of Church. The initial stage of the relation established is represented by the words, "The Lord said unto Abram." The literal meaning of the words gives us the relation of speaker and hearer. But inasmuch as the speaker is instructor, enlightener, inspirer, and the hearer is the enlightened and inspired, the words in this case represent the initial stage of enlightenment and influx, and the response thereto. So that Abram's reception and response in obedience may be taken to represent in general man's response to the Lord's influx and revelation, the initial act of turning to the new spiritual light when the influx and revelation come. In the language of Swedenborg, the phrase "the Lord said unto Abram" signifies "the first turning of the mind"; that is, the phrase represents, corresponds to, this first turning, and gets this meaning from the correspondence of the outer act of saying, to the inner act of en-

lightened and willing response. The turning involves man's natural states which are left behind, and the spiritual states which are brought to view and made objects of attainment.

What the Lord said to Abram was: "Get thee out of thy native land, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, to a land that I will show thee." This helps us to interpret the turning, and represents in summary the states to be turned from. The native land, the kindred, and the father's house involve the influences exerted upon the early developing life, and represent the natural affections and interests called forth by this environment. Swedenborg classes all these as "corporeal and worldly," exterior and interior; for Abram was a man of merely external life, absorbed in bodily cares and in the affections of domestic and pastoral interests. His leaving native land, kindred, and father's house to go to the land of Canaan, represented turning from natural life to spiritual life. Further description of the spiritual life represented is contained in the promises of blessing, and the various developments of this life are summed up as the exercise and enjoyment of celestial and spiritual affections. This turning from the natural to the spiritual is a universal fact for all regenerating men. It is exemplified in the case of every man who makes a beginning of the regenerative process. It was exemplified most perfectly in the Lord as a child, and for this reason Abraham and his course of life represent the Lord and the experiences of His childhood. What these experiences were, the spiritual sense of this story of Abraham describes with Divine completeness. These spiritual experiences are imperfectly exhibited in ordinary childhood. But in both of these cases the details of the experiences seem to lie far beyond the powers of our imagination and perception. We make little headway with the details of our own spiritual experiences and of those whom we know best, but still herein lies the task of preaching the spiritual sense. We get help of inestimable importance in following Sweden-

borg's interpretation of the stages of Abraham's journey through Canaan to Bethel.

The journey as a whole represents the development of the early stages of religious affection, the early affectional life of regeneration. At first, the experience is little more than obscure feeling, a feeling of response to the Lord's Word, however made known, but represented in the language of the story by "The Lord said unto Abram." As the state develops, the experience becomes fuller and the enjoyment more distinct. There is a conscious possession of heavenly affections acquired under the Lord's guidance. The actual attainment of these affections, "the celestial things of love," is represented by the statement, "they came into the land of Canaan." We may think of this state, represented by coming into the land of Canaan, as general, marking the kind of development represented by the whole journey through the land up to the departure for Egypt. In other words, what we have is a description of the developing states of celestial love.

Abram set out and journeyed in the spirit of obedience. Simple obedience is a genuine and primary spiritual quality; it is the spiritual quality of childhood. It is the immediate response of affection to the wish of the parent, and later to the will and commands of the Lord. Abram's ready obedience was representative of this affectional spiritual quality in all childhood, and supremely in the Lord's childhood. In the light of this significance, we see how it is that the story of Abraham represents in general the early stages of spiritual development, and especially the spiritual development of childhood, both that of ordinary childhood and that of the Lord's childhood. We see that it is primarily an affectional development. In the course of this development, the affections grow more and more distinct and their qualities begin to appear. This state is represented in the story by Shechem; as Swedenborg expresses it, Shechem represents the first appearing of the celestial things of love. Shechem has this meaning from the fact that it was the first

stopping place on the usual road through the Holy Land from Syria. As such, it corresponds to the first stage of the progress from the obscure state of affection to full life in the Lord's presence. The celestial things of love are the growing desires to live for the Lord and from the Lord. In the Lord's childhood, Shechem represents the second stage of His progress from infancy to complete union with the Divine Love.

The further development of this affectional life is marked by distinct *perceptions* of the nature and qualities of the affections exercised and enjoyed. Perception is the characteristic quality, or function, of love and its affections. Even at this early stage, affection gives the light to see the qualities of the life that leads to the Lord. But inasmuch as the Lord gives the affection, He appears in the quality of the affection. This is represented by the words, "The Lord appeared to Abram." In general the Lord appears to us in the love we receive from Him; He appears when we receive the quality of the affection which leads to Him. It is the affection that perceives, and perceives in the light that is given in it and through it. The quality of the perception at this stage is represented by the oak grove of Moreh. This meaning depends upon the correspondence of oak. In general trees correspond to firmly established principles of thought and conduct. This implies perception of the qualities of life and the environment. The leaves of the tree correspond specifically to perceptions. The oak with its rugged branches and its firmly rooted trunk, withstanding as it does the winds and storms that beat against it, corresponds to the tenacity with which children hold on to the principles which are taught them by their parents. The perception here represented is called by Swedenborg the first perception, and is the state in which the qualities of affections, and their connection with the outer details of life, become objects of attentive interest. This involves the distinction between the affections for heavenly life and for the Lord on the one hand, and the natural and hereditary evil

affections which oppose them on the other. "And the Canaanite was then in the land" refers to these hereditary evil affections which are brought to view at this stage.

It would seem from the account so far that we have reached a rather advanced development of affection and knowledge. But we recall that we are still at the oak tree stage, a knowledge of outward facts and general principles. In other words, we are still dealing with the life of affection with only the beginnings of perception. The next stage takes us to a further development of knowledge, knowledge of outward life, and perception of inward quality.

The story continues, "And he removed thence to a mountain on the east of Bethel, and stretched his tent, with Bethel towards the sea and Ai on the east." The name Bethel means "house of God," and represents here knowledge of the affections that lead to a life from God. The mountain, because of its natural elevation, represents elevation of affection. Bethel was to the west from the mountain, which represents that the knowledge meant by Bethel was obscure. Whereas Ai on the east represents in contrast with Bethel clearer knowledge of worldly things. Removing to the mountain with Bethel to the west and Ai to the east represents, therefore, an advance from first perception to a further but still obscure knowledge of the qualities of heavenly love, but to a relatively clear knowledge of worldly things. Building an altar and calling upon the name of the Lord represents exterior and interior acts of worship in that state.

The need for more knowledge is represented by the famine in the land, and acquiring the knowledge by the journey to Egypt.

This summary outline of the spiritual meaning of the early part the story of Abraham illustrates to some extent the kind of preparation needed to preach the spiritual sense; but of course it does not illustrate the kind of work we would do in writing the sermon itself. This work of preparation must be done in the study, and the results used

in writing the sermon. The sermon should be a literary product, a work of art, which would use the material furnished in the study, but would not use the method of the study. The sermon with a clear grasp of the spiritual meaning of the text should go on to apply the meaning to a concrete situation in life, and throw the light of the spiritual meaning upon the situation. This would involve analyzing the situation into its spiritual elements, and present a picture, as vivid as possible, of how the spiritual elements combine to constitute the essence and meaning of the situation. The sermon should also point a moral; it should point out how the spiritual meaning solves the problems of thought and conduct which the concrete situation presents. In other words, it should interpret life, affectional, intellectual, and practical. In this way, it would move the heart, enlighten the mind, and urge practical effort. The sermon should throw the light of the spiritual meaning of the Bible upon the complexities and perplexities of actual life. Perhaps there never was a time in the history of the world when the complexities of life were so perplexing. Christian thought is in confusion, and Christian conduct is without clearly and firmly grasped principles. The immense opportunities of modern life are perverted to self-seeking and self-indulgence. The sermon must recognize these conditions, and throw the light of the spiritual meaning of the Bible upon them. The sermon should also recognize the efforts made to use the opportunities of modern life for human welfare, and should point the way to co-operation. In short, the sermon should be enlightening and hortative in the broad sense as well as in the specific sense.

This rapid survey of the story of Abraham has also illustrated to some extent, but quite inadequately, the difficulties encountered in our efforts to get and put into language the spiritual sense of the Bible. We have had to stop short in our analysis and description of the spiritual states and events involved. Our perceptions and our vocabulary fell short of the requirements. The chief and central difficulty

met us in our effort to give meaning to the words, "the celestial things of love." We got as far as recognizing that these are affections, and therefore we accepted affection as the key word of our analysis and discussion. But we found that affection was too general a term, and we had to use various qualifications to adapt it to our purpose. No doubt, all celestial things of love are affections, but all affections are not celestial things of love. The word "celestial" points to a certain quality and level of affection. We tried to designate these by using the qualification, affections of love to the Lord. But here again there are natural and spiritual affections of love to the Lord; and the word "celestial" must be distinguished from these, and placed upon a higher level. If we try to meet the difficulty by using the form, affections which we receive from the Lord, we again use the word in too wide a sense, for in the last analysis all our affections are from the Lord. Swedenborg points to the experience of the men of the Most Ancient Church as an example of the celestial affection, which the story of Abraham seems to involve. But this calls upon our imagination and spiritual perception to give us definite ideas; our actual experience seems to be inadequate to furnish examples. Our recourse seems to be to general abstract ideas and to definitions. But what we need is the experience which would furnish the states meant, and also the ideas and the words to describe the states. In other words, we need a body of ideas and a new vocabulary. Does this requirement make the situation hopeless? Not if we are willing to make the effort, elevate our thoughts, refine our perceptions, and lead practical lives in the atmosphere of purified affection and knowledge.

Perhaps enough has been said to impress the fact that preaching the spiritual sense is the crowning work of the New Church.

Lewis F. Hite.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE CRITICS' DEN

By Benjamin A. Whittemore

At the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne, Switzerland, in August 1927, and attended by four hundred representatives from seventy independent Christian church organizations the world over, some of the delegates anticipated that Biblical criticism would claim an important part in the deliberations; but, according to Bishop Charles Gore (see E. D. Soper's "Lausanne," p. 103), "The conference showed hardly any interest in criticism. Occasionally a German professor or an Anglican speaker brought it into the foreground, but it got no attention." That Biblical criticism, which has done so much to undermine the faith of Christians, especially in Germany, in England, and in America, should have received such negligible consideration by a conference assembled to consider matters of faith, may be considered truly remarkable; but that was as it should have been, as will become increasingly evident to all well-informed persons in the near future. Of course, by the term "Biblical criticism" as here used is meant what is more specifically called the "Higher Criticism," a line of teaching which the above quotation implies has not had much effect outside Germany and English-speaking countries.

While the term "Higher Criticism" does not necessarily imply anything derogatory, it has during the last half century become so identified with the theories and claims of the Wellhausen school of critics (sometimes called the Graf-Wellhausen school) that it has acquired a decidedly negative and destructive signification,—negative and destructive as regards its bearing upon the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures and upon their reliability as historical records, and thus as regards its bearing upon the very foun-

dations of Christianity itself. At the present time the term is commonly understood as having this negative implication; and it will be used in that sense throughout the present paper.

Though utilizing, so far as pertinent to his interests, the work of his predecessors in the field of the "Higher Criticism," Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) is commonly said to have inaugurated a new day in that department of learning. His position in the history of the "Higher Criticism" of the Old Testament is sufficiently well expressed for our purpose in the following summary statement by Martin Kegel, Ph.D., one of the foremost scholars of Germany in the critical field of today, and author of several important treatises in rebuttal of the "Higher Criticism": "Hegel begat Vatke; Vatke begat Wellhausen: Wellhausen begat Delitzsch." This statement implies that Wellhausen had at least two forerunners in the special line of attack that he launched against the Hebrew Scriptures: but if we cared to go into the history of Old Testament criticism as a whole, we should find that his predecessors were very many, most significant being the Jewish philosopher, Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677), who questioned the Mosaic authorship of much that was attributed to him, the French royal physician and professor of medicine, Jean Astruc (1684-1766), who called attention to the Divine names in Genesis as proof of different documents used by Moses, and a contemporary of Wellhausen's, Karl Heinrich Graf (1815-1869), whose book on the Old Testament published in 1866 set forth the theory, subsequently adopted by Wellhausen as part of his own foundation, that the Prophets were earlier than the Law, and the Psalms later than both. But from the standpoint of his presuppositions Wellhausen worked out the critical theory afresh so thoroughly, and presented it in such a clear and intelligible form, that he carried conviction to hosts of uncritical scholars, and his contentions have become widely accepted as "the assured results" of Biblical scholarship.

Hegel — Vatke — Wellhausen. The presuppositions adopted by Wellhausen involved the philosophy of history of Hegel (1770-1831) as developed by his pupil Wilhelm Vatke (1806-82) in application to the Israelites, together with the special twist given to that history by the Grafian theory. From this standpoint the traditional miraculous experiences of the Hebrew nation as recorded in the Old Testament had to be set aside in favor of a non-miraculous and naturalistic evolution of its history and religion. According to this philosophy, a revealed religion, such as was traditionally supposed to have been imparted to the Jews largely through the instrumentality of Moses, was an impossibility; and therefore the only reasonable way to interpret the whole body of Old Testament Scripture—literature, law, and worship combined—was to do so on a natural history basis.

The story of the Israelitish nation as concocted by the historical imagination on the basis of Hegel-Vatkean-Grafian presuppositions, and adopted by Wellhausen and his disciples, runs about as follows. The ancestors of the Hebrew race were a nomadic Bedouin group of northern Arabia. Abraham (if an historic personage) was an absolutely illiterate sheik of that uncivilized, fetish-worshipping people. His descendants in Egypt generations later were still nomads; and such slight culture as the Egyptians then possessed had practically no effect upon them. Whatever modicum of fact there may be in the account of the flight from Egypt, there is little of importance in connection with the story of the Exodus beyond the leadership of a man named Moses, who led the tribes during their nomadic wanderings in the desert, whose own belief tended to monotheism, and who tried to propagate that belief among his barbarous and idolatrous followers. As illiteracy was nearly at one hundred per cent at that time, and skill in writing was practically non-existent, Moses gave no laws to the tribes beyond a few oral precepts and statutes. The development and the engrossing of a legal code in the Mosaic

age are not to be considered possible. After some years of wandering in the desert, these nomadic tribes made forcible entry into the land of Canaan, settled among the people of the land, whose religious and ethical ideas soon became blended with their own. Oral precepts, statutes, legends, and folk-lore constituted such literature as they then possessed. Then came prophetical voices, lashing them for their misdoings, and again emphasizing the monotheistic faith which Moses had tried to instill into them, and which they had been so lax in observing. The words of the prophets involved ethical ideas which antedated the legal codes later ascribed to Moses. These prophets of the ninth century B.C. were the pioneers of Hebrew literature, and to them the beginnings of national history are to be attributed. About their time elementary law codes began to be set down in writing. In the course of a few more generations the life of the nation as such became increasingly endangered by aggressions of hostile neighbors; and in the interests of national solidarity to withstand the threatening destruction, a crafty ecclesiastic named Hilkiah, with the aid of certain confederates, fabricated a body of laws (the most considerable up to that time), and managed to foist it upon King Josiah as a body of genuine Mosaic legislation. Not long after this the nation was conquered by the Persian forces, and many thousands of the Israelites were carried in bondage to Babylon, where they inevitably came under the influence of the religion, the laws, and the culture of that country. Now for the first time in the nation's history, the thought and the faith recorded in Babylonian literature became known to the Israelites. The effect of this culture upon the enslaved Israelites resulted in the preparation among them of an extensive law code, together with a cosmology and race history incorporating the traditional beliefs of their conquerors; and when Ezra and Nehemiah were permitted to return to the homeland of their forefathers, they succeeded in imposing these fabrications upon the Israelitish nation in the name of Moses. Such earlier

Israelitish literature as was thought desirable of permanent preservation was soon combined with the Babylonian forgeries to constitute the Pentateuch and a considerable part of the remainder of the Old Testament as we now have it. Interpreting the history of Israel in this way, we see the idolatry of the Bedouin religion of the time of Abraham develop into a qualified monotheism in the Mosaic age, later change into an agricultural cult after the invasion of Canaan, subsequently modified into an ethical religion under the influence of the prophets, and finally, through priestly ingenuity, into a legal religion, when monotheism became firmly established. This, in brief, is a fair summary of the teachings of the Wellhausen school of the "Higher Criticism."* Whatever its plausibility on its own presuppositions, it was in fact the product of a vicious, extravagant, and unrestrained exercise of the historical imagination.

The seeming plausibility of this rewriting of Israelitish history from the subjective standpoint supplied by Hegel and Vatke would not have carried much conviction but for the seemingly definite evidence as to its truth furnished by the Astrucian theory of two or more documents in Genesis, as this theory was applied beyond Genesis by later critics, who also advanced all sorts of negative arguments based upon supposed or possibly actual flaws in the best Old Testament texts, until the Hexateuch stood forth a matter of shreds and patches (witness the Polychrome Edition of the books) constructed mainly of four supposed documents, usually designated by the letters J, E, D, and P, with all sorts of redactional and editorial adjustments, fixings, and trimmings. While Astruc apparently believed in the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, and did not go beyond that book in his analysis, he innocently furnished the scalpel with which the dissection of the entire Old Testament was begun; and the infidel critics of succeeding generations furnished will-

*This outline in the main has been drawn from the Aftermath Series, Part VI, pp. 231-3.

ing claws and teeth in the effort to complete the dismemberment.

While the first five books of the Old Testament have been traditionally attributed to Moses, and have been commonly called the Pentateuch, the "Higher Critics" have considered the book of Joshua as on exactly the same plane, and have included it in their analysis of what they have called the Hexateuch. According to their analysis (omitting details), the four supposed documents of which the Hexateuch is mainly composed may be described as follows: J embraces a large part of Genesis, also Exodus i-xix; E includes the parts of the Hexateuch that are not assigned to J, D, and P; D embraces most of Deuteronomy and about a third of Joshua; P embraces all of Leviticus (except chapters xvii-xxvi, commonly called the "holiness code," and considered a separate document, to which the symbol "H" is applied), nearly all of Numbers, a large part of Exodus, parts of Genesis (especially the first chapter), and about a third of Joshua.

Of the four supposed documents just mentioned, the one designated by "J" (because of the prevailing use of the word "Jahweh" for God) was supposed to have been written, except for the earlier legendary matter incorporated in it, about the year 900 B.C. The others, designated by "E" (because of the use of "Elohim" for God), "D," and "P," were supposed to have been written about the years 750, 625, and 450 B.C. respectively. The Jahwist document describes the coming of the Davidic monarchy; and the sort of religion set forth in it is that assumed to be of the time of Elijah and Elisha. The Elohist document is supposed to manifest the influence of the moral preaching and work of the prophet Amos and his comrades, and to have been produced about their time. The Deuteronomic document (D) was assumed to have been the result of the developments from the principles laid down in E, and to have become crystallized in definite form by the time of the Reformation of King Josiah in 620 B.C. The Priestly or foundation docu-

ment (P) was asserted to have been the book of doctrine brought by Nehemiah from Persia to Jerusalem in 450 B.C., and there adopted as the charter of the Jewish community. During the following century and a half, the earlier documents (J, E, and D) were said to have been incorporated in P bit by bit, the final work of assembling and editing the entire collection into its present form being completed not long before the year 300 B.C.

If not previously familiar with what has thus far been presented, any reader may feel that there is an element of amazing dishonesty involved in this whole matter, dishonesty involving many leading men of the Israelitish nation, and making God Himself the principal party in the deception. Professor Archibald Duff, D.D., LL.D. (1845-?), in his "History of Old Testament Criticism" (Putnam's, 1910), attempts to meet such inevitable protest in the following paragraph of his little book:

> When any one is unwittingly tempted, at sight of the critical methods of these Elohistic narrators, to say "Is not this forgery?" or perhaps to use some stronger words, then we [he is speaking as a mouthpiece of the "Higher Criticism" we are considering] beg such light-hearted accuser to read the history of those Elohistic men. That history has, indeed, been all unknown until within the past forty years [i.e., "all unknown" until after 1870, when Wellhausen began to write]; but, unknown so long and hidden as they were, those men were great moral heroes. They did more than invent the Decalogue; they laid a deep, noble, wonderful foundation for the grandest sort of literary study and criticism, inasmuch as they were entirely regardless of any traditional sacredness of the religious literature that had been written by their fathers. They demanded not submission to writings, but to the sense of manly duty; and they exhibit in their work a true creative power. (P. 34.)

With but slight modification the paragraph just quoted might have been placed by Duff at the close of his eulogistic consideration of the Old Testament documents, in glorification of the compilers, editors, redactors, forgers and other personages more or less dishonorably implicated in the production of the Hebrew Scriptures, according to the theory of the "Higher Critics." Indeed, those who assume the

validity of the rewriting of Israelitish history by the "Higher Criticism," cannot deny that deception was a main motive behind the entire process of the construction of the supposedly sacred books of the Hebrews. This accusation will receive further consideration later in this paper.

As we have just seen, according to Duff the above history of the people of Israel and of the documents constituting their Sacred Scriptures was "all unknown" previous to the year 1870. To be sure, about that time some of the critics were entertaining the theory set forth by Graf in 1866 to the effect that the Prophets were older than the Law, and the Psalms more recent than both; but it was not until the '70s than this theory was forced upon the attention of the world with the weight and authority of seemingly adequate scholarship. While this theory originated in Germany (as did practically all the elements in the destructive aspects of Biblical criticism), and while its power in influencing the judgment of Bible scholars is rightfully attributed to the genius of the German professor, Julius Wellhausen, its success in winning the acceptance of a large proportion of the Bible students among English-speaking peoples was due mainly to one brilliant young Scotchman, William Robertson Smith.

William Robertson Smith (1846-94) was the son of a Scottish Free Church minister. He was educated at home and at Aberdeen University. In 1866 he entered the Free Church College, Edinburgh, as a student of theology, and while there he spent a couple of summers in Germany, where he probably became acquainted with the works of the noted Bible critics of that time. From 1868 to 1870 he was assistant to the professor in physics at Edinburgh University; and in the latter year he was chosen Professor of Oriental Languages and Old Testament Exegesis at the Free Church College, Aberdeen. A few years later he was appointed on the editorial staff of the "Encyclopedia Britannica" (9th Edition, 1875), and proceeded to contribute to it a series of articles of a most radical type echoing German pronounce-

ments in the field of Old Testament scholarship; and through his influence articles by Wellhausen on Israel, the Pentateuch, etc., were also published in that authoritative organ of British scholarship. The articles for which he was responsible immediately led to hostility on the part of conservative Scottish scholars, who succeeded in bringing him to trial for heresy in 1876. Decision, however, was not reached until 1881, when he was removed from his professor's chair; but by that time he had become enormously popular; moreover, he had been advanced to sole editorship of the "Britannica."

The younger Bible students especially were carried away by the new theory and its brilliant presentation by Wellhausen (1844-1918) and Smith (1846-94); and a number of them were soon enlisted as ardent advocates of these views. Notable names in this connection in England and America were the following (with dates of birth): in America, Crawford H. Toy (1836) and Charles Augustus Briggs (1841); and in Great Britain, T. K. Cheyne (1841) and Samuel R. Driver (1846). These young men and others began battering at the conservatism of the English-speaking Bible scholars, resulting in a gradual subduing of protesting voices. According to the "Britannica" (11th Edition, 1910): "From about 1880 the prevailing temper had changed; within a decade of this date the change had become great; since then the influence of Old Testament criticism has grown with increased acceleration."

Such men as those just named were soon appointed to professorial chairs; and they also became active as contributors to, and editors of, important publications in the field of Bible scholarship, such as the "Encyclopedia Biblica" (1899-1903), Hastings "Bible Dictionary" (1898-1904), the successive volumes of the "International Critical Commentary," not to mention many independent productions. Conservative Bible scholarship had apparently been worsted; the "Higher Criticism" had apparently won an unquestionable and permanent victory. This is perhaps best

evidenced by the almost unqualified voicing of "Higher Critical" views in important works, even very recent ones, for wide popular consumption by the rank and file of Bible students, such as the one-volume Bible Commentaries published during the last twenty years or so (Dummelow's, 1909, Peake's, 1919, Gore's, 1928). Certainly with such seemingly overwhelming evidence of the acceptance of the "assured results" of the "Higher Criticism," it may seem futile to say anything in behalf of the older views that are thought by many to have been discarded and consigned to the scrap-heap. But in such an important matter we need to oppose with clearness and firmness those influences that tend to undermine the very foundations of Christianity; for "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do" (Ps. xi, 3).

We are reminded at this point of a story very applicable to the subject before us. In 1795 the unitary authorship of the poems attributed to Homer was subjected to attack in the modern higher critical spirit by the German scholar, F. A. Wolf, who maintained their composite authorship, and with such success that during the following century his views became almost universally accepted. Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, the pre-eminent Greek scholar of Johns Hopkins University, however, held to the traditional view, even when almost alone in that position. Early in the present century Professor John A. Scott put the Wolfian theory to the test by a thorough examination of all pertinent facts, with the result of a complete demonstration of the falsity of the Wolfian theory, and of the truthfulness of the traditional view of Homeric authorship. Not long after the publication of these results, Professor Gildersleeve amused one of his classes by a bit of humor, expressed about as follows:

> I am going to take you into the *sanctum sanctorum* this morning, young gentlemen, and teach you how to make a reputation. "There are tricks in all trades"—but ours. . . . First, you are to get a plausible theory. Then work it up and publish. When you come to a point that is generally believed, but no one can possibly prove, say "Every schoolboy knows." When you reach one that you think

is so, but you know that you cannot prove, say "It is uncontrovertible that." You will soon have a call with a large salary; and it will take some other man, or men, twenty years or more to work the thing out, and get at the truth. Meanwhile, you will have had your fine place, and will have enjoyed a great reputation. When the other man at last appears, people will say: "Who is this little upstart? What does he know about it anyway? Doesn't the great Professor So-and-so say such and such things?" By the time he succeeds in getting recognition, you will be dead, and won't care what happens. BUT [Professor Gildersleeve stopped speaking, and the ominous sound of that "but" produced profound silence until he went on with utmost seriousness], young men, if you want to do anything worth while, anything that will last, don't you work that way.*

In this little skit Professor Gildersleeve may possibly have had in mind the Wellhausen school of Bible critics; at any rate it seems to fit their case very well, as we shall see. But whatever was in his mind, the incident should convince us that so-called scholarship may be either genuine or imitation. We shall presently see, I trust, that much of the supposed scholarship of the "Higher Critics" is imitation.

It behooves us to notice that the Wellhausen attack on the Old Testament Scriptures was launched by young men (see dates a few paragraphs back). The new theory, though its germs may be discovered in the writings of critics before 1870, was incubated, hatched, and nurtured by young men under or about thirty years of age. The views advocated by them were not the results of real scholarship on their part. They were not thoroughly versed in the knowledge of the Old Testament text; in short, about the details involved they knew too little to avoid making many mistakes in the use of such evidence as they advanced to prove this or that point in their argument,—mistakes that could readily be shown on adequate examination. But young manhood is notoriously averse to authority and to the restraints imposed by tradition; therefore it is perhaps not surprising that,

*From "A Layman's View of the Critical Theory," by Herbert W. Magoun, Ph.D., p. 61 (as reprinted from *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January 1913).

allured by the seeming plausibility of the new ideas, they threw tradition (as well as discretion) to the winds, and unwittingly enlisted on the side of the modernistic efforts to undermine the foundations of Christianity,—"unwittingly," for it would surely be going too far to assume downright insincerity and maliciousness on their part, though the spirit of evil and falsity was ready to inspire them. Moreover, it is perhaps not surprising that, when the new theory was well launched with such supporting arguments as the ingenuity of its early promoters could devise, it fascinated the immature minds of many young Bible students, and, long before the remonstrances of conservative scholars could be formulated and adequately emphasized, convinced these young men of its truth. The more mature and devout Bible authorities of that time, and the students who have since come under their influence, have not been much affected by the Wellhausen school of criticism, which has seemed to them but a surface manifestation of disturbance, sure to subside in due time. So the conservative opposition to the new theories and arguments was not sufficiently prompt, forceful, or conspicuous to prevent grave trouble resulting from the wide acceptance of the "Higher Criticism" by those whose scholarship is of the superficial kind that drifts with the current of popularity.

That the assumed scholarship of "Higher Critics" in Germany and English-speaking countries has had most disastrous effect in undermining faith in the foundations of Christianity is evidenced by the conspicuous drift everywhere towards Unitarianism, by the increasing disaffection for the churches and what they stand for, and by numerous infidel publications by supposedly scholarly men. In evidence of this, perhaps I cannot do better than quote from a recent book by Professor Harry Elmer Barnes of Smith College, entitled "The Twilight of Christianity" (please note the title), copyrighted by the Vanguard Press of New York in 1929. Writing on "The Essential Facts in regard to the Hebrew and Christian Bible," he says:

> In setting forth some of the more relevant facts designed to give us a clear and reasonable view of the nature of the Bible, we do not pretend to be divulging any novel discoveries. . . . Indeed, what we shall have to say represents only a very brief and selected summary of the commonplaces disseminated in any self-respecting theological seminary in America today. Yet we believe that every candid reader of what follows will be compelled to admit that these few and highly incomplete observations will serve thoroughly to undermine the orthodox view of the Bible, and will demonstrate that it has no valid claim to exercise the dominating intellectual influence which it has maintained over the majority of those living in western civilization down to our own day. . . . [He then goes on to set forth concisely the view of the Old Testament held by the Wellhausen school, after which he continues as follows:] The few facts we have assembled above relative to the progress of scholarship in clearing up the complicated problems involved in the dates, authorship, and composition of the Bible are important chiefly as showing that during the last century and a half we have piled up absolutely conclusive proof of the human authorship of the Bible, and have disposed for all time of the orthodox notion of its uniquely inspired nature as a product of divine revelation. (Pages 149 and 153.)

I have already shown that the "Encyclopedia Britannica" from its ninth edition in 1875 to its thirteenth edition in 1926 (the latter being identical with the eleventh edition of 1910, except for the addition of three supplementary volumes) stood unqualifiedly for the "Higher Criticism," and therefore, more than any other single publication in the English language, tended to shape the beliefs of those influenced directly or indirectly by it. Of the rising tide of protest against the "Higher Criticism" its readers were kept in ignorance. But there was such a tide; and as it was based on real scholarship, it was bound eventually to make itself felt in the pages of some edition of that storehouse of information and learning. It is most gratifying to be able to announce to those not already apprised of the fact, that in one part of the article on the "Bible" in the fourteenth edition of the "Britannica" just published, the joint-authors of that part, Professors George Buchanan Gray and Arthur Samuel Peake, both of whom have been conspicuous

spokesmen of the "Higher Criticism" in the past, have expressed the present condition of affairs as follows (pp. 509-510):

The Grafian theory [which affirmed that the Prophets were earlier than the Law] found adherents in Holland and Great Britain, but only hostility in Germany till, in 1875, B. Duhm's *Theologie der Propheten* broke the consensus of German critics. Wellhausen's history of Israel in 1878 was "the crowning fight in the long campaign." From that time the theory became so widely accepted, though some very eminent scholars held out against it, that it remained for many years the orthodox critical view. Recently, however, from various sides the position has been attacked. Those who stand for the traditional view have argued that the distinction in the use of the divine names cannot be relied upon in the documentary analysis, because the Hebrew text is in this respect frequently shown to be an insecure basis, owing to the variations in the Septuagint. This has been urged not simply by defenders of tradition such as Dahse and Wiener, but also by Eerdmans, who has formulated a new critical theory. . . . Some of those who accept the documentary analysis have shown a tendency to move from the Grafian position, sometimes in a more conservative, sometimes in a more radical, direction. This has in both instances been connected with an attack on the generally accepted date of Deuteronomy. This has been the pivot on which the criticism of the Pentateuch has largely turned. It was the unquestioned belief of Grafians and pre-Grafians alike that the Law Book of Josiah's Reformation was to be identified with some form of Deuteronomy. . . . It has recently been argued that Deuteronomy was really much earlier than the seventh century B.C. . . .

. . . The more recent development [in the theory concerning the eschatology of the prophets] has been characterized by a reaction [from Wellhausen's position] with which the names of Sellin in one way, Gunkel and Gressmann in another, have been associated. This has not been limited to the criticism of the prophets; it has affected most of the Old Testament books. It has been specially due to the feeling that the history, literature, and religion of Israel must be placed far more fully in their international context. Israel was a very young people; great civilizations and cultures had been developed millenniums before its birth, especially in Babylonia and Egypt. To these Israel owed a great debt. The earliest legislation of the Hebrews drew on much more ancient law and custom. The stories of the Creation and the Deluge go back to myths and legends of a far older time. The eschatological scheme found in the prophets is asserted to be of foreign origin. The Hebrews

themselves were in contact with various civilizations outside of Palestine, while in Palestine itself layer after layer of foreign culture had been deposited. THE GENERAL RESULT HAS BEEN TO REVERSE THE RADICAL DIRECTION OF CRITICISM. . . .

(Although the last sentence quoted was in small type, its importance justifies putting it in capitals.)

In other words, the "Higher Criticism" has suffered defeat, and is now in retreat. This fact, admitted by the signatories of the above statement, Professors Gray and Peake, though modified in the next sentence by words to the effect that this reversal in direction has not yet made itself universally felt (let the reader recall Professor Gildersleeve's remarks about the time needed for such rebuttal to attain full effect), is momentous. When that publication which has been and is recognized by all English-speaking peoples as representing the authority of the best scholars of the entire world, and which was the principal means of imposing upon that world the blight of the Graf-Wellhausen theory concerning the Hebrew Scriptures, goes so far in withdrawing from its former unqualified advocacy of that theory as to say that "The general result [of recent scholarship in the field of Old Testament studies] has been to reverse the radical direction of criticism," it constitutes a practical confession of its sins of the past, its present repentance, and a pledge for better behavior in the future, when we may expect (in the next completely revised edition) a frank repudiation of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and a relegation of it to its proper place in the history of Biblical criticism,—as an infidel attack, inevitably doomed to failure, on the Word of God. As a side remark, it may not be out of place here to call attention again to Professor Gildersleeve's admonition to one of his classes, and to the fact that the illustrious early advocates of the Graf-Wellhausen theory are now all dead.

However that may be, the above admission of defeat as found in the fourteenth edition of the "Britannica," removes

any need of attempting here to set forth even in outline the lines of argument for the traditional standing of the books of the Old Testament on the basis of ethnological, archeological, linguistic and other evidence, as alluded to in the closing sentences of the last quotation above. But as the "Higher Criticism" began its dissection of the Hebrew Scriptures into four main documents by use of the Astrucian clue furnished by the principal terms for God as found in Genesis, it may be well to give a summary statement showing how invalid is that instrument of dismemberment. Shortly before Professor John Skinner published (1910) his Commentary on Genesis in the International Critical Commentary series, edited by Professors C. A. Briggs and S. R. Driver,

> Professor Schlögl . . . set out [in the *Expository Times* of September, 1909] the results of studies in the Old Testament seminar at Vienna as to the occurrences of the Divine appellations from Gen. i. 1 to Ex. iii. 12. His results are as follows:
>
> The Tetragrammaton [i.e., the Hebrew four-letter word transliterated into English as Jahweh] *alone* occurs 148 times in the Massoretic text of Gen. iv. 1-Ex. iii. 7 inclusive. In 118 places other texts have either God or LORD God. *Elohim alone* occurs 179 times in the Massoretic text of Gen. i. 1-Ex. iii. 12. In 50 passages other texts have LORD (in 47 cases LORD *Elohim*); but those texts which have *Elohim* instead of the Tetragrammaton are in Professor Schlögl's opinion less important. Both words occur together in the Massoretic text of Gen. ii. 4 to iii. 23 twenty times; but there is only one passage (iii. 1) in which all the texts are unanimous on the point. After some further discussion the professor concludes that "it is consequently quite unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God." . . . Owing to the supreme importance of this point and to the conviction with which Astruc's disciples adhere to the clue, it has been thought desirable to follow the *Expository Times* discussion at some length.
>
> It is unhappily necessary to add that Dr. Skinner has since published a commentary on Genesis in which he substantially repeats what he said in the *Expository Times* [where he had affirmed not more than 50 variants in Genesis] without taking cognizance of the facts and arguments urged by Professor Schlögl and the present writer [Harold M. Wiener]. Thus he takes no notice whatever of the Hebrew variants or of Professor Schlögl's figures,

and proceeds on the assumption that there are not more than 49 or 50 variants in Genesis, and repeats the argument about the probabilities of error in Greek texts. As his preface is dated as late as April, 1910, the discussion raises issues that are too grave to be considered here, but a full reply will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1910.*

As Mr. Wiener had excellent evidence that Professor Skinner was acquainted with the results of Professor Schlögl's and his own investigation of the Divine names in Genesis, he promptly accused Professor Skinner of wilful dishonesty and deliberate intent to deceive the public, and brought that accusation immediately to the attention of Professors Briggs and Driver, the editors of the series in which Professor Skinner's "Genesis" appeared. The correspondence involved ran from October, 1910, to May, 1911, appeared in large part in the issue of *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1911, and was reprinted in Wiener's "Pentateuchal Studies" (1912), pp. 90-113. On page 105 of that volume Mr. Wiener has a footnote, in which he sums up as follows:

> Meanwhile I desire to lay stress on the following points: (1) For a century and a half the critics followed Astruc's clue practically without textual investigation; (2) When recent textual researches had rendered their position insecure, Dr. Skinner deliberately misrepresented the facts in an attempt to bolster up the documentary theory; (3) When the attention of the general editors was drawn to this, they took no steps to undeceive the public, which had been deceived under the cover and sanction of their names, and put forward the contentions contained in the joint letters [upholding Dr. Skinner].

In the same volume the subject is considered further, and is finally summed up as follows (pp. 137-142).

> The net result of all this is to show, beyond any possibility of doubt, that the general editors of the International Critical Commentary have belied every principle of scholarship, and even of

*Harold M. Wiener's "The Origin of the Pentateuch," pp. 36-37. The discussion referred to in the final sentence had title "The Swansong of the Wellhausen School," and re-appeared in full in Wiener's "Pentateuchal Studies" (1912), pp. 49-89.

honor, in violation of the very doctrines that one of them has accepted and striven to propagate throughout his life. To all appearance they have as little compunction about deceiving their readers as a fraudulent company promoter has about deceiving the public whom he hopes to despoil. [He adds in a foot-note at this point, that in the case of Dr. Driver the best illustration of the above statement is his volume on Exodus (1911) in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.] I use this clear language purposely, because I feel that a state of affairs has arisen which must be terminted. We have to deal with a number of professors who abuse their positions in the last way one would expect, for it must be remembered that the public supposes them to be men of high standing actuated by the purest motives, adopting and advocating particular views because those views arise necessarily from the relevant evidence. Now I feel that the time has come when their conduct has passed all reasonable limits, and it is a public duty to say so. If men who should be, and profess to be, servants of truth undertake to abuse their positions by deliberately propagating falsehood, a time comes when it is necessary to denounce them publicly as falsifiers who would never dare to enter a witness-box to sustain their allegations on oath and under cross-examination. . . . I once wrote to Dr. Driver, in a private letter for the information of the general editors and Dr. Skinner, that, if the latter brought an action for libel against me, it would be the end of the school of Astruc in England, and I now repeat this statement for the information of a larger public. . . . Of course he [Dr. Skinner] could not support his published statements in the witness-box without committing direct perjury, and that is why there can be no question of his bringing proceedings for libel. . . . But if the principal of a theological college, after repeated warnings, persists in giving currency to statements which he could not support in the witness-box without committing perjury, a time comes when the interests of the public necessitate a full and clear exposure. There is a further reason why no action can be brought. At present the critics are able to use their control of the technical press in the interests of their theories: but an action would give wide publicity to inconvenient facts, and would clearly expose the tactics that they have pursued for years. . . . Old testament studies have indeed come to a pretty pass when theological professors and principals can behave as these men have been doing.

It may be remarked here in passing, that the behavior of the "Higher Critics" we have been considering has some resemblance to their own account of the fraudulent imposi-

tion upon the Israelitish people of the supposed documents of the reformations of King Josiah and of Ezra and Nehemiah.

I have been quoting from the writings of Harold B. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law, whose name was mentioned in the passage quoted above from the fourteenth edition of the "Britannica" as a defender of tradition. Wiener,* who was of Jewish descent, approached the critical problems from the standpoint of a lawyer. He incidentally remarks: "A lawyer reading the higher critics should feel an eager desire to get them into a witness-box and cross-examine them" (Origin of the Pentateuch, p. 126). By instance after instance in his various writings he shows what a laughing-stock a competent lawyer with adequate knowledge of the facts would make of each and every one of the "Higher Critics," however noted. Elsewhere in the little volume from which I have just quoted, and which was prepared for the enlightenment of any mind distressed by the "Higher Criticism," he makes such statements as the following:

> Many arguments . . . put forward in favor of the division of the Pentateuch . . . would never obtain the support of any man of ordinary sanity and judgment who took the trouble to investigate the phenomena for himself. (P. 98.)
>
> The documentary theory is not so much the result of the difficulties of the Massoretic text, as of the mentality of the critics. There is a state of mind to which anything, however preposterous, becomes credible, and it is this condition which is responsible for the Higher Criticism in the form in which we know it today. (P. 105.)
>
> The higher critics have not succeeded in doing what they thought they had, but they have been successful in their attack on a few glosses (such as Deut. x. 6f.) and a few corrupt words, and also on the order of the present text. . . . The discussion has revealed the fact that in the book of Genesis Moses undoubtedly incorporated pre-Mosaic sources, whether oral or written, in some cases without modifying the phraseology. . . . These are the main scholarly

*While visiting Palestine last summer, Wiener was killed during one of the uprisings.

gains from the discussion provoked by the higher critics:—a better comprehension of laws and history, a better text, the recognition that the Pentateuch incorporates post-Mosaic notes [glosses, etc., that it is the function of textual criticism eventually to eliminate], and that Genesis contains many pre-Mosaic elements. As to the fantastic documentary and evolutionary hypotheses, they are doomed, however numerous the professional reputations and publishing enterprises that depend upon them. P. 145.)

While these comments of Wiener's concerning the "Higher Criticism" are made from the standpoint of a lawyer well versed in the facts of the case, it will be well also to hear what a life-long student of the linguistic and other arguments utilized by the "Higher Critics" has to say concerning the scholarship of Professor Samuel R. Driver, author of the well-known "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," who has been generally considered the most authoritative spokesman of the "Higher Criticism" in the English-speaking world. In his "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament" (1926), Dr. Robert Dick Wilson (1856-), Professor of Semitic Philology in Princeton Theological Seminary, says concerning Driver:

Reader, if the most plausible, and probably the most scholarly, of all that school of modern critics that delight to assail the integrity of the scriptural narratives and to use so frequently the modest appellation, "all scholars are agreed," will make such palpable blunders in a matter as to which there is abundant evidence to show that the Scriptures are right, what dependence will you place on him when he steps beyond the bounds of knowledge into the dim regions of conjecture and fancy? If, when we can get abundant evidence, the documents of the Bible stand the test of genuineness and veracity, and the charges of the critics are proven false, upon what ground of common sense or law of evidence are we to be induced to believe that these documents are false or forged when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them? (P. 120.)

Those who desire information bearing upon the refutation of the other main points in the rewriting of Israelitish history by the "Higher Critics" may find it not only in the writings of Harold M. Wiener already mentioned, but also in such books as Professor Wilson's treatise just quoted

from, and especially in a number of pamphlets entitled "The Aftermath Series," prepared to show the discomfiture of the "Higher Criticism," and published (1923-25) for enlightenment of the public by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The first nine parts of this work deal with the criticism of the Old Testament, under the following separate headings: (1) The Crisis of Criticism, by Bishop Horace M. Du Bose, D.D., editor of the series; (2) The History of the Israelitish Priesthood, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (3) The Religious Reformation of Ezra, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (4) Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?, by Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D.; (5) The Integrity of the Old Testament, by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B.; (6) Archaeology versus Wellhausenism, by Professor Ernest Sellin; (7) Away from Wellhausen, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (8) The Five Books of Moses, and the Question of Their Origin, by Professor Max Loehr, D.Th., Ph.D.; and (9) The Law and the Prophets, by Bishop Horace M. Du Bose, D.D. But perhaps the fullest recent summary of the evidence for the integrity of the Sacred Scriptures and against the contentions of the "Higher Criticism"—evidence concisely put, and largely of an internal sort either ignored or unjustifiably discounted by the "Higher Critics" —is that contained in a publication by Harper & Brothers (1928) entitled "The Bible Under Fire," by John L. Campbell, D.D.

For my purpose it will be sufficient to conclude this part of our consideration by quoting the final two pages of Dr. Wilson's "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament," as follows:

> The time has come to conclude this summary of evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against the Old Testament. We hope that evidence adduced will be sufficient to show that the general reliability of the Old Testament documents has not been impaired by recent discoveries outside the Old Testament. The literary forms are in harmony with what comparative literature would lead us to expect. The civil, criminal, and constitutional laws agree with what the civilization of the ancient nations surrounding Pales-

tine would presuppose; while the ceremonial, moral, and religious laws are differentiated from those of others by their genesis in a monotheistic belief and a divine revelation. The use of writing in the age of Moses and Abraham is admitted by all, and the existence of the Hebrew language in the time of the Exodus is assured by the glosses of the Amarna letters, as well as by the proper names on the Egyptian and Babylonian Monuments. The general correctness of the Hebrew text that has been transmitted to us is established beyond just grounds of controversy. The morphology, syntax, and meaning of the language of the various books conform with what the face of the documents demands. The chronological and geographical statements are more accurate and reliable than those afforded by any other ancient documents; and the biographical and other historical narratives harmonize marvelously with the evidence afforded by extra-biblical documents.

We therefore send this volume forth with the prayer that it may strengthen the faith of those who still believe in God and in Jesus Christ His Son. We need not and do not fear the truth about the Bible. We welcome all sincere and honest study of its origin, purpose, and meaning. But is it too much to ask and hope that more of those who have been appointed by the Church to teach its history and its doctrines should devote their time and energies to the defense of its great and fundamental, unique and outstanding, facts and implications, rather than to the picking of flaws in the garments of the prophets and to the punching of holes in the robe of Christ's perfection? It may not be ours to remove all the difficulties, to harmonize all the apparent inconsistencies, to explain all the mysteries, and to solve all the problems of the Old Testament; but we can show at least, that we believe that Christ and the Apostles are more likely to be right than we, that the age-long judgment of the Church with respect to the Bible may after all be right, and that our business is to defend with all lawful means the citadel of faith rather than to join the hosts of the infidel in the assault upon its walls. (Pp. 213-214.)

Let me repeat the final clause of that last sentence: "Our business is to defend with all lawful means the citadel of faith rather than join the hosts of the infidel in the assault upon its walls." We need to stress the idea here expressed; namely, that the negative "Higher Critics" are a host of infidels attacking the citadel of our faith, in short, our very foundations. Many are the denials by those infected with the teachings of the "Higher Criticism" that it affects their

faith in any serious way; in fact, many assert that the critical point of view is a distinct advantage, because of the freedom of outlook it gives. But all such denials and assertions can be seriously discounted in view of the general drift in the religious world around us towards Unitarianism, humanism, and infidelity, which drift is certainly in part a logical result of unwarranted dealing with the Old Testament in the historico-critical way. My quotation from Professor Barnes's "Twilight of Christianity" is adequate evidence of this; and further evidence, from the standpoint of Dr. Martin Kegel, is found in the summary statement which I quoted in part toward the beginning of this paper, and which it is now to my purpose to quote more fully, as follows:

> Hegel begat Vatke; Vatke begat Wellhausen; Wellhausen begat Delitzsch [1850-1922], who in his "Great Deception" is the gravedigger of the critical theory of the development of Israelitish history.

There we have concisely expressed the logical outcome of the "Higher Criticism" in definite form. From the standpoint of that "Higher Criticism," the Old Testament, as a supposed revelation inspired by God, is a "Great Deception"; for the intellectual acumen of the "Higher Critics" has proved it a purely human production involving a most sacrilegious forgery. The Old Testament thus goes into the scrap-heap, and the religions of Jews and Christians alike are left without foundations.

At this point it behooves us to consider foundations not alone from the standpoint of the Old Testament, nor even from that of the New Testament also; but in addition from that of the Writings that have supplied the special foundation of the New Church. And in turning to give brief consideration to this point of view, we may profitably give our attention first to certain warnings uttered by Swedenborg in the early pages of his "Arcana Cœlestia" (nn. 126-128), as follows, in our reprint of which we have italicized and capitalized certain words by way of emphasis:

126. Verse 17. *But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof dying thou wilt die.* It is lawful by every perception from the Lord to acquire knowledge of what is true and good; *but not from self and the world,* or to search into the mysteries of faith by sense and of outward knowledge, whereby the celestial of faith is destroyed.

127. The fact that men were disposed to search into the mysteries of faith by means of the senses and of outward knowledge was the cause of the fall of the Most Ancient Church, that is to say, of their posterity, . . . and also is *the cause of the fall of every church;* for thence come both falsities and evils of life.

128. The worldly and corporeal man says in his heart, If I am not informed concerning faith and matters of faith by the senses, that I may see them, or by outward knowledge, that I may understand them, I will not believe. And he confirms himself by the consideration that natural things cannot be contrary to spiritual. He would therefore be informed by the senses on subjects that are heavenly and Divine, which yet is as impossible as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle. The more he would be wise by such means the more he blinds himself, until he believes nothing, not even that that there is anything spiritual and that there is eternal life. This comes from the principle he assumes. And *this is to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,* whereof the more one eats the more dead he becomes. *But he who would be wise not from the world but from the Lord, says in his heart that he ought to believe in the Lord, that is, in the things that the Lord has said in His Word, because they are truths; and from this principle he thinks. He confirms himself by reason and knowledge, by things sensual and natural; and SUCH AS ARE NOT CONFIRMATIVE HE CASTS ASIDE.*

Here we have the touchstone by which to bring ourselves to the test as to loyalty. Is the food of the tree of life appetizing to us; or do we find more to our taste the food offered to us by those who gather the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? Are we altogether affirmative towards the Word of the Lord and the Writings of Swedenborg as our foundations, and do we accept and endorse the results of modern scholarship only in so far as they in no wise injure those foundations? Or are we affirmative towards the "Higher Criticism"; and are we keen in discovering supposed flaws in Swedenborg's Writings;

and are we fascinated by the seemingly brilliant results of modern scholarship in psychology, philosophy, comparative religion, etc., etc.; and are we inclined to admire greatly the conspicuous spokesmen in the religious world around us? In short, do we think we have a criterion of truth to apply to everything that comes to our attention, so that we are immune to the dragonistic permeation of "modern thought" with its insidious undermining influence? Speaking of "dragonistic permeation," I cannot do better than quote the following paragraphs by a New-Church writer unknown to me, who has expressed warning thoughts that need much emphasizing at the present time:

> The dragon is represented in the Apocalypse as "persecuting the woman who brought forth the man-child." Now, the *woman* is the New Church; the Man-Child is the Divine Truth, that is, the new Revelation given to the New Church. The vision signifies that the dragon will exert itself to infest the New Church by its influence, and it is also written that *many* shall be seduced. That is to say, the mental attitude of many in the New Church shall be seduced and brought under subjection to the spiritual spheres of the perverted and devastated Christianity of to-day. The penetration of the influence *into the midst* of the New Church is what we call "The dragonistic permeation" . . .
>
> The sphere by which many in the New Church seem to be most easily affected is the sphere that insinuates scepticism concerning the Revelation of the New Church itself . . .
>
> It is sufficient to read certain articles published in Journals which call themselves New Church, in order to see the influence that the sphere emanating from these dragonistic ultra-subjectivists has in the minds of the authors of these articles, and that, consequently, "dragonistic permeation" is not an illusory thing. We find, in fact, that some of these writers and theologians of the New Church treat the New Revelation given by the Lord to the New Church in the same way that the above-mentioned dragonists treat the Old and New Testament Scriptures; that they look upon the Lord's Second Advent as the dragonists look upon the Resurrection of our Lord. In fact, they seem to claim that the Lord's Second Advent is not an event accomplished in the Revelation given by the Lord to the New Church, and, in spite of the formal teaching of the Writings on which the New Church is founded, they refuse to give to the Second Advent of the Lord the value of an accomplished fact. For some of them, too, all is ultra-subjective! . . .

Spiritually and theologically extravagant, they seriously declare that the writings of the New Church, though they on the whole are a Divine Revelation, nevertheless lack Divine authority, and in consequence, they are of the opinion that they can reject all in this Revelation which does not accord with their personal sentiments, with their prejudices, and with the lucubrations of their minds.

Certain it is, that if we trust overmuch to our own judgments with regard to "modern thought," without constant reference to the foundations from which we should judge, we shall soon find ourselves going astray. We may think and call ourselves "liberal" and "progressive,"—terms that are the rallying cries of Unitarians, "free-thinkers," and infidels generally,—but certainly, from the standpoint of the New-Church foundations, those terms are hardly applicable to loyal New-Churchmen. He who professes as his religious foundations the Word of the Lord and the Writings of the Lord's Servant, Emanuel Swedenborg, and believes that the New-Church organization has a great future before it, and that it will become increasingly prominent through the progress of the centuries, is truly progressive only when he is strictly loyal to the New-Church foundations. To the extent that he is "liberal" and "progressive" (as those terms are frequently used), to that extent he is disloyal to the best interests of the New Church, and to that extent he is re-actionary to the underlying current of the Lord's rule on earth, and is a distinct hindrance to the real advancement of the New Church.

If we accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Savior, and Emanuel Swedenborg as the human instrument used in effecting His Second Coming, then certainly we shall accept their testimony, both definite and implied, as to the Old Testament Scriptures. For us that testimony should be sufficient assurance of the practical accuracy of the traditional text of the Sacred Scriptures as used by Swedenborg. We need not deny that in it there are slight imperfections due to the errors of copyists, the incorporation of glosses, and perhaps some disarrangement of passages; but it is the function of honest textual criticism to correct such imper-

fections; and we may trust to the assertion of such critics that, when their important work has been completed, all arguments of the "Higher Criticism" will have been proven invalid and harmless.

The demonstration of the Word of God as Divine revelation, and its re-establishment as such in the esteem of the Christian Church, is the special task of the New Church. The following passage from Swedenborg supports this contention:

> Since it was foretold that at the end of this [the first Christian] church also, darkness would arise, owing to the want of knowledge and acknowledgment of the Lord as the God of heaven and earth, and owing to the separation of faith from charity, lest the genuine understanding of the Word should thereby perish, therefore it has pleased the Lord now to reveal the spiritual sense of the Word, and to make manifest that the Word in that sense, and from it in the natural sense, treats of the Lord and of the church, and indeed of them alone; and many other things, also, by means of which the light of truth from the Word, almost extinguished, may be restored. (Doctrine concerning the Sacred Scripture, n. 112.)

Standing firm on the foundations of the New-Church organization,—namely, the Word of the Lord and the Writings of Swedenborg,—no loyal New-Churchman can favor the supposed "results" of the "Higher Criticism." In fact, if he is really a scholar, and if he has examined the evidence pro and con the traditional belief concerning the Sacred Scriptures as a Divine revelation, he should know that the Old Testament has come forth unscathed from the efforts of the "Higher Critics" to tear it to pieces.

BENJAMIN A. WHITTEMORE.

"HOW LONG HALT YE BETWEEN TWO OPINIONS?"

By Anita S. Dole

IS there not a striking lesson for the New Church today in the powerful story of Elijah and the prophets of Baal? Looking back at the history of Israel, we say: "How could they have been so foolish as to be continually drawn aside into the worship of the gods of the nations round about? Had they not been taught both by precept and by bitter experience the result of such idolatry? And had they not repeatedly promised to serve Jehovah alone?" But are we wiser than they? The Jews were a comparatively small body of people, carrying on ordinary daily life in constant association of one sort or another with large numbers of men and women with whom the validity of idolatry was unquestioned. In the time of Elijah, pagan influences were active in the very heart of the Jewish nation, where Jezebel the Zidonian reigned as queen, slew the prophets of the Lord at will, and brought four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and four hundred prophets of the groves to eat at her table. Surely we can read a message to ourselves in the drought which fell upon the land in Ahab's day, and in Elijah's cry to the people: "How long halt ye between two opinions?"

It is interesting that within the last year or two an almost identical challenge has come from a representative of the other side, one of the most frank and consistent of the modern prophets of Baal. In his book "Religion Coming of Age," Professor Roy Wood Sellars presents his belief that the world is passing from a stage in which men, on account of their ignorance of the forces and laws of nature, necessarily postulated a Divine Creator, to a stage in which they are able to do entirely without such a postulate:

"Nature is becoming self-sufficient and primary" (p. 164). In this state of affairs, he recognizes three possible procedures: (1) fundamentalism; (2) liberalism; and (3) systematic thought (p. 276). These three attitudes he describes as follows: "The fundamentalists cling to the old cosmic perspective; the liberals follow the drift of change at various rates, according to their education and mental capacity; the philosophers are trying to think the whole situation through thoroughly and systematically in the light of modern knowledge." As might be expected, Professor Sellars identifies himself with the philosophers; and it apparently does not occur to him that anyone who "thinks the whole situation through" could fail to come to the conclusions to which he comes. He differs from many naturalistic writers, however, in expressing genuine respect for both the fundamentalists and the liberals, and sympathetic understanding of their attitudes in relation to their background. He says: "When I say that liberalism is the procedure of following the drift of thought and experience in our age, I wish to be understood as praising it. Such following is not a passive affair; it involves readjustment and interpretation in regard to all sorts of concrete problems which the philosopher as such does not have to meet. And when I bear in mind the emotional pull of tradition in religious matters . . . I have the highest respect for all liberals" (p. 276). But he adds: "In matters of thought they are at a disadvantage with respect to the highly trained thinker who, from the very beginning, has adopted an objective attitude and has given his life to persistent reflection with the best intellectual equipment possible." The intellectual condescension in this remark is inescapable, but, it seems to me, partially justified by the muddled condition of much of our current thinking.

Professor Sellars's book is a frank, clear, and consistent exposition of the logical conclusions of naturalism as it affects religion. It should be read carefully by all New-Churchmen who wish to "orient" themselves in the world

of modern thought. Its greatest service will be its clear demonstration of the fact that, in the so-called "conflict of science and religion," the real issue is, and has always been, between belief in a personal God and belief that nature is "self-sufficient and primary," and that these two postulates are eternally opposed to each other: there is no possible logical compromise. Exactly the same conclusion is expressed by Walter Lippmann in his new book "A Preface to Morals": "It follows, then, that in exploring the modern problem it is necessary consciously and clearly to make a choice between these diametrically opposite points of view. The choice is fundamental and exclusive, and it determines all the conclusions which follow" (p. 143).

This conclusion is in accord with the teaching of the Word and of the Writings of Swedenborg. The central theme of the Old Testament story is: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Again and again Jehovah offers the people their choice: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." And in the New Testament, the Lord teaches us: "No man can serve two masters." We are familiar with Swedenborg's teaching in regard to this possibility of choice involved in rationality, as the fundamental condition of our human nature, raising us above the animals; and we know

that if the universe were so constituted that we were *forced* to recognize and serve the Lord, there would be no joy in the service, and consequently no happiness for the human race; and that therefore the material universe is necessarily so created that the naturalistic hypothesis is possible.

But we must remember that it is, after all, only an hypothesis. Professor Sellars says: "Both of these views were *à priori* possible. Investigation *might* have justified the Biblical story. The universe might have been centralized in an ideal person; events might have been planned in an epic way. But investigation has unfalteringly shown that the universe is actually of the second kind" (p. 283). He forgets that this "investigation" has prevailingly been based upon the assumption that nature is self-sufficient; that is, it assumed at the start the thing it claims to have discovered. He says elsewhere: "Is it not the very life of science to postulate that the universe is spatial, temporal, measurable, orderly?" (p. 215). Here his use of the word "postulate" is interesting, as elsewhere (pp. 224-5) he objects to the "postulation" of a God, on the ground that it makes the approach to the universe deductive rather than inductive. In this connection, there are many significant statements in the book, such as: "Immortality and a separable soul would add a story to the universe which science and a naturalistic philosophy could not enter" (p. 201). Here we have the key to the logic of naturalism: everything which cannot be explained naturally is *ipso facto* impossible. Whenever any facts loom up on the horizon which threaten the structure which the naturalist has built up, he ostrich-like hides his head in the sand. One is constantly reminded of the Lord's words in Matthew (xiii, 15): "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are full of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Nowhere is this naturalistic assumption more evident,

and at the same time more subtly effective, than in the field of Bible study. If one were, for example, to go through such a book as Trattner's "Unravelling the Book of Books" —which purports to put in comprehensible form the general results to date of modern Bible scholarship—and mark every assertion which depends for its validity upon the denial of the supernatural, he would realize how cautious one should be in accepting even the most positive "findings" of scholars in this field. Yet these findings are incorporated with very little discrimination into the thought and writing of many ministers whose belief in God and in Revelation is unquestioned. Such men are led astray by the specious claim of the scholars that they are seeking only Truth, and employing only the scientific method. Mr. Trattner, for example, says: "The science of Biblical criticism rests four-square upon the position that the Scriptures have nothing to fear, any more than the mountains must fear the science of geology, or the stars the science of astronomy. The Bible is just what it is, and all that men can do is to find the truth about it. Honest scholarship therefore seeks to destroy but one thing: misconception" (p. 281). This sounds well, but unfortunately "misconception," in Mr. Trattner's mind, appears to be identical with belief in any supernatural origin of the Scriptures, as the following quotations, all dealing with the history of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible, indicate: "The sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries may be all rolled together in telling the story of the warfare of reason against unreason, of naturalism against supernaturalism, of common sense against the dark forces of obscurantistic faith (p. 201). . . . But before men could practice the Higher Criticism it was necessary first of all to get rid of the intolerable dogmatism that the Bible is a divinely supernatural book (p. 270). . . . Yet he (Reimarus) realized that in order to understand the Bible it was first necessary for men to get rid of the pestiferous notion of its divine origin. He claimed, what almost every sensible theologian today concurs in, that the Bible is to be

read like any other book" (p. 273). This is the major premise which actually underlies all the reasoning in the book, and so affects all its conclusions.

There is, indeed, a legitimate and fruitful field in the study of the natural history of the Bible, examination and comparison of manuscripts, study and presentation of archæological and historical research bearing upon the background of the Bible narrative; but even such study, when its results are colored by the presupposition that the Bible is of merely human authorship, is in large part untrustworthy. In this type of study, contradictions in the letter of the Word necessarily imply that errors have crept in, and that one or the other contradictory statement, or perhaps both, must be discarded; historical discrepancies, anachronisms, changes of style, all cast doubt not only upon the identity of the human author, but upon the validity of the message; and especially, supernatural occurrences, such as miracles and visions, are discredited. The attempt to defend the Bible, while accepting the conclusions of such study, is sterile. Mr. Lippmann says: "Something quite fundamental is left out of the modernist creeds. At least something which has hitherto been quite fundamental is left out. That something is the most abiding of all the experiences of religion, namely, the conviction that the religion comes from God. Suppose it were true, which it plainly is not, that Dr. Fosdick by his process of selection and decoding has retained 'precisely the thing at which the Bible was driving.' Still he would be without the thing on which popular religion has been founded. For the Bible to our ancestors was not simply, as he implies, a book of wisdom. It was a book of wisdom backed by the power of God himself. That is not an inconsiderable difference. It is all the difference there is between a pious resolution and a moral law" (p. 47). Churchmen like Dr. Fosdick adopt the principle of selection and discrimination in the use of the Scriptures because they see no other solution of the problems presented by the letter of the Word. Yet the

Lord has given the world another solution; gave it, indeed, as soon as it was needed. It is a significant fact that the first volume of the "Arcana," with its clear recognition of the inconsistencies in the letter of the Creation story and their origin from an older Word, and its revelation of an internal sense which alone can explain and unify them rationally, should have been published just four years before the "Conjectures" of Jean Astruc which, dealing with the same inconsistencies from the natural history point of view, laid the basis for the "scientific" evolution of the Higher Criticism. If Robert Ingersoll, as we have recently been reminded, could say that Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondences was the only thing that could save the Bible, may we not pertinently ask ourselves if we, as New-Churchmen, should not be duly cautious about accepting the conclusions of the followers of Astruc?

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to argue the case between the two primary hypotheses: a personal God, or Nature as all-sufficient. Presumably, everyone in the New Church has made his decision in favor of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our trouble is that we do not bring this belief rigorously to bear in our judgments of current thought outside the New Church. Another comment of Mr. Lippmann's is all too true of us: "Religion has become for most modern men one phase in a varied experience; it no longer regulates their civic duties, their economic activities, their family life, and their opinions" (p. 82). While we assert without hesitation that the Lord Jesus Christ is God, and while we try, with varying degrees of earnestness and success, to model our personal conduct upon His example, nevertheless we show a tendency to accept with very little critical examination the conclusions of naturalistic thought. When some issue forces us to admit that the logical conclusions of our religious belief are not in accord with the later scientific dogmas, we recoil from the necessity of giving up either, and fall back upon all sorts of illogical expedients in the effort to reconcile the two. Professor

Sellars says: "There can, I think, be little doubt that the majority of people are puzzled because they try to think in both of these ways at once. Many of our riddles which seem so perplexing to the average man arise from a criss-crossing of these two logics, of these two ways of approach to reality. Nothing is thought out clearly, and compromises of all sorts are snatched at by liberal thinkers. Thus evolution is thought of as a natural process, and yet some divine agent is asserted to guide it. There is an attempt to double everything in a ghostly way. Personal agency is an added activity which somehow accompanies natural causality and robs it of its brutality. Plan and purpose can thus be discerned where science can find neither. The two logics are superposed upon each other" (p. 161). This is a keen analysis of many of our judgments.

Why do we lay ourselves open to such criticism? Why do we not boldly accept Elijah's challenge: "If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him"? Why do we so often try to pick our precarious way between these two alternatives? Simply because it is actually the path of least resistance. To go either way takes courage. We do not want to choose the path of the nature worshipper; we do not want to relinquish our faith, to lose our comfort in affliction, our belief in the future life, our sure guide in conduct; we do not want to lose our Church associations, to grieve our family and friends, to break a thousand ties which our belief has forged for us. On the other hand, to face our modern intellectual world with the prospect of having to swim for our lives against the prevailing current requires determination. Many of the books we read, the lectures we hear, the points of view of our acquaintances, are based upon the assumption that the natural history of man is the whole history of man, that natural science is the only reliable source of all our information, and the only hope for our future progress. If we presume to question the validity of the latest scientific conclusions, we shall be laughed at, and classed with the "fundamentalists" as

"narrow," "hidebound," "ignorant of modern scholarship." We shall be accused of holding the Church back, of alienating the young people, of antagonizing those outside the Church. If we venture upon a critical analysis of the work of a popular preacher, educator, or scientist, we shall be told that we ought to be looking for the truth he has to give instead of for his shortcomings, and seeking to learn instead of to criticize; that to set ourselves up in judgment on the work of men who have given their lives to the study of the subjects on which they write is ridiculous presumption. Such charges are troublesome because, however strongly we may feel that they are unwarranted, many of us find it hard to put our finger on the flaw in them. Yet that flaw is sufficiently obvious. Swedenborg gives us the clue to it when he says: "The more anyone is endowed with talent and knowledge, and is in the negative, the more insane he is" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2588. 9),—the "negative" having been previously identified with the state of those "who have blinded themselves by not being willing to believe anything which they do not apprehend by the senses." In the same section, he might well be characterizing some of our modern "scholars," when he says that spirits who are in this negative attitude make "wisdom to consist in being able to invalidate what is Divine, and deduce it from what is natural," and adds: "Many who in this world have been esteemed wise, are pre-eminently of this character." Another helpful paragraph which should be carefully studied with a view to clarifying our attitude toward what we read and hear is number 2568. In it Swedenborg declares that the affirmative principle, "that leads to all intelligence and wisdom," is "to affirm the things which are of doctrine from the Word, or to think and believe within ourselves that they are true because the Lord has said them." To champion this declaration today is to swim against the current indeed. Yet the Lord encourages us in resistance to naturalistic thought: "Woe unto them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because

they are many; and in horsemen because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord" (Is. xxxi, 1). "The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness" (Luke xi, 34-35).

Facts are facts, but the analysis and organization of them are determined by one's point of view, and the eye of modern thought is evil to the extent that the naturalistic premise governs its investigations and conclusions. If one wishes to test for himself how great this extent is, let him take any of the popular books which attempt, as Professor Sellars's does, to review for the layman the discoveries and conclusions of modern science, and pause each time he comes to such an expression as "clearly," "obviously," "it is evident that"; and let him ask himself honestly, "Is it clear?" In practically every case he will be forced to answer: "If you agree that nature is all, it is clear; not otherwise." Here, for example, is a paragraph from Professor Sellars—the italics are mine: *"There can be little doubt* that the idea of spirits and the idea of revelation grew up together. Shaman, medicine man, and prophet, all inherited and carried on a tradition of communication with the gods. *It is generally admitted* that dreams and trances furnished much of the material for this tradition. The religions of the book are *clearly* but high developments of this kind of phenomenon. The intellectual and ethical level is higher, but the assumption is the same" (p. 230). When one undertakes to mark the occurrence of such unwarranted phrases, he is amazed at the amount of pure guess-work which underlies the conclusions of so-called "scholars."

There are, of course, scientists who adhere faithfully to the scientific method and try never to state that a thing is a fact when it is an hypothesis; but their work seldom reaches the average man at first hand. There are also scientists who believe in a personal God, and for whom the facts of

science confirm this belief, as Swedenborg tells us they should; but these make careful distinctions between fact and hypothesis, and in many cases stand squarely against popular currents in scientific thought. Stallo, for example, was charged by other scientists with being a "mere destructionist." It is an injustice to such men to cite them carelessly in defense of modern science in general, as if they upheld the prevailing theories; and doubtless many naturalistic scientists would think the injustice fully as great to "science" as to Stallo. There are other scientists, many of them, who express belief in God, but either their religious belief and their scientific opinions are kept carefully separated, with no attempt at logical coördination, or their God, like Professor Mather's, might just as well be called the "curvature of the cosmos." Professor Mather prefers the phrase "The Administration of the Universe." He says: "The terms are sufficiently generalized, and of course it is wise to use such generalized terms as that. When we are not hampered by facts, then we can very easily construct phrases and draw conclusions—and the truth of the matter is that mankind has not yet acquired sufficient facts to permit us to describe the Administration of the Universe in specific or concrete terms" (Address before the General Convention of the New Jerusalem, 1929). We are surely justified in honoring Professor Mather personally for his courage in retaining and openly declaring belief in God in the face of the atheistic conclusions of many of his brother scientists; but that does not excuse us for assuming that his belief in God enters into his acceptance or rejection of scientific hypotheses and conclusions, and makes them valid for us. If we are "not hampered by facts about God," it seems rather obvious that He is just about whatever we wish to make Him. This is no different in effect from the natural history concept of religion, which makes the idea of God wholly the product of men's minds, and denies the possibility of any permanently authoritative Revelation. This type of belief in God, being without intellectual con-

tent and logical foundation, is actually nothing but blind adherence to tradition; it is much better than no belief at all, but it has no real message to the modern mind. Whatever may be the cause of our frequent uncritical acceptance of the results of modern "scholarship," whether worldliness, mental laziness, or false modesty, we cannot honestly excuse ourselves on the ground that many scientists express belief in God; for many do not; and many of those who do, make no use of their religious belief in their scientific labors.

But why should the individual New-Churchman concern himself with passing judgment on the results of modern scholarship? Why should he not simply withhold judgment, or, if he does criticize, confine himself to pointing out the good and true in what he reads and hears? There are, it seems to me, two reasons why it is the peculiar business of the New-Churchman to examine critically all the expressions of modern thought which come his way, and to point out fallacies as well as facts. One is that the good characteristics of modern thought, being manifested in material benefits without number, are so evident to the average man that, having no rational criterion of judgment, he swallows without question the intermingled evils and falsities, and as a consequence tremendous havoc has already been wrought in the moral and spiritual life of our age. And the other is that the New Church as an organization exists for the specific purpose of working out intellectually and manifesting in its life the truly rational philosophy of God, man, and the universe which has been revealed by the Lord to meet the very need of the modern world.

Walter Lippmann's "Preface to Morals," already cited, which is being widely read at the present time, is illuminating in its analysis of the characteristically "modern" state of mind, and in its unconscious and unintentional piling up of evidence that nothing but a rational belief in a personal God will satisfactorily meet the situation. He addresses his book to those who—like himself apparently—having lost their traditional religious belief, feel "that there is a vacancy

in their lives." He says: "When such men put their feelings into words they are likely to say that, having lost their faith, they have lost the certainty that their lives are significant, and that it matters what they do with their lives. If they deal with young people they are likely to say that they know of no compelling reason which certifies the moral code they adhere to, and that, therefore, their own preferences, when tested by the ruthless curiosity of their children, seem to have no sure foundation of any kind. They are likely to point to the world about them, and to ask whether the modern man possesses any criterion by which he can measure the value of his own desires, whether there is any standard he really believes in which permits him to put a term upon that pursuit of money, of power, and of excitement which has created so much of the turmoil and the squalor and the explosiveness of modern civilization" (p. 4). In the course of the book, Mr. Lippmann follows out the results of this loss of authoritative standards in the three main fields of business, government, and sex relations. He points out all too clearly the responsibility of the naturalistic hypothesis for the moral chaos in these three fields, and the wholly unsatisfactory nature of the various attempts at compromise made by the religiously-minded scientists and the scientifically-minded Churchmen. He shows that all these attempts at compromise actually make science the final judge of the validity of any belief, and thus rob belief of any guarantee of permanence. The substitute for religion which he tentatively suggests, although couched in the language of modern psychology, is not distinguishable from Stoicism.

Books like Walter Lippmann's should prove to us how barren is the attempt we are so often urged to make, "to meet the scientist half-way" in our conversation and literature. Such attempts may indeed make our social contacts outside the Church smoother, but they make no impression on anyone who really feels the need of what the New Church could give. Compromise has always been a sign of weak-

ness. We find the powerful denunciations of the prophets inspiring; we do not criticize the Lord's admonitions, which were given in no uncertain terms; we recognize the force and necessity of the very definite charges made by Swedenborg against the beliefs and ways of life current in his day. Yet we allow ourselves to be persuaded that we cannot today criticize popularly accepted ideas and ideals without "holding the Church back."

We should indeed read as much of the intellectual output of our day as we have time for, and we should not read it merely to criticize it. The more we understand and sympathize with others, the more intelligent may be our efforts to help them. But understanding and sympathy do not necessarily imply agreement, and when we ignore points of difference, we are giving nothing. The attempt to "see the good" in everything, when it is not counterbalanced by willingness to oppose the bad, all too readily degenerates into the habit of reading our own ideas into everything. Every writer has the right to be judged upon the basis of what he actually says considered as a whole, and not upon a chance phrase or sentence taken out of its original context and fitted into an alien one. When we say, for example, of a materialist or of a Unitarian, that his thought is "wonderfully close to the New Church," we are not doing the man, the New Church, or the world the slightest good. The man himself will certainly not feel complimented by the gratuitous connection, and the bystander will have yet another complication added to his already deep puzzlement as to what the New Church really is.

When we try to word our doctrines in such a way that they cannot possibly offend anyone, we take from them all possibility of real helpfulness. Why should we spend our efforts in trying to give the world back an empty echo, in showing it how little we differ from it, and keep hidden in a napkin the talent which the Lord has entrusted to us to use in His service? If the New Church has nothing to say which anyone else may not say as well or better, if it has

no more positive answer to the world's uncertainties than some variation of the compromises and expedients with which the denominations and cults are experimenting, why should it continue to struggle for its existence? If being a New-Churchman has no intellectual consequences, there is lack in the New-Churchmanship. Plenty of other people believe in a life of service, and lead it to the best of their ability. But this does not make them "New Church," in the sense of having a revealed doctrine about the nature of service.

It is being pointed out to us on all sides that the world is taking more interest in religion than ever before. Many people are reading books on religion, and some books on the subject have ranked with the "best-sellers." Two conclusions appear very generally: one is that life without belief in a personal God has proved for most people chaotic and unsatisfactory, and that no adequate substitute for that belief has been found; the other is that nevertheless a very great many sincere and earnest people can see no possible way of return to belief in a personal God. They no longer even argue about it; they take the impossibility for granted. The reason for this is, that these people accept as proved certain scientific hypotheses with regard to the history of the race which are logically inconsistent with the doctrine that the universe is planned and governed by a Person. So long as we too accept the scientific hypotheses, we can make no appeal whatever to this typically modern mind, because it has thought the case through, and nothing but an attack upon its premises will warrant its attention. It has no use for compromise or sophistry. A great many young people today are of this type. Partly, at least, through our negligence, they have come to accept science instead of the Lord as their foundation, and our task is to show them that they have chosen the sand instead of the rock.

We cannot show this by moving our own houses down on the sand too. We must ourselves build boldly upon the rock, and let the steadfastness of our structure prove the

wisdom of our choice of foundation. None of us finds his house ready built for him, nor easy to build. But the materials have been given us, and the working plan. There are many problems of construction for us to work out; but we may be sure that we cannot succeed by leaving the rock, or by substituting materials or plans of our own. To leave the metaphor: having chosen to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the one only God of heaven and earth, we must not allow ourselves to be led into evasive formulations of our belief which alter its essential character; having chosen to believe that the Word is Divine, we must not carelessly accept conclusions in regard to it advanced by scholars who study it as a merely human product; having chosen to believe that we ought to shun evil as sin against God, and that the good we do is from the Lord alone, we must not let the vocabulary of modern psychology befuddle us out of our conviction of sin, or into the belief that we are inherently good; having further chosen to believe that the Lord gave Emanuel Swedenborg open vision into the spiritual world, and made him the instrument of His Second Advent in a new revelation of truth, we must not be beguiled into judging the Writings in the light of modern scholarship instead of judging modern scholarship in the light of the Writings. "If the Lord be God, follow Him" applies to our brains as well as to our hearts.

And following the Lord intellectually in the midst of the complexities of the present age will require all the brains that we have. It is the task of the New Church as an organization to preserve and disseminate in their integrity the Writings which constitute the new revelation; it is the task of the ministers of the Church to study the Word in the light of the Writings, and to draw from it sound and constructive spiritual principles for the guidance of those who wish to make their religion the test of truth for their thought as well as for their life; it is the task of each individual New-Churchman, minister as well as layman, to use these principles in every phase of his life, holding them

clearly as tests of the validity of thought and conduct, and working out their practical application to the problems of his particular occupation or profession. The Lord in His First Advent taught men a new Way of Life; His Second Advent revealed the Way of Thought which underlies—directs—that Way of Life, in order that men in a rational age might develop a higher rationality than that of the natural mind, and by means of it defend and preserve faith in the Lord and in His Word against the intellectual attack of naturalism. The New Church today needs to remember David and, laying aside Saul's armor, choose its smooth stones from the brook.

There is, indeed, much that we can learn from the world about us: on the intellectual side, a vast new body of facts in all fields, facts which no more threaten rational faith than the water poured over Elijah's altar and overflowing the trench about it affected the consuming power of the fire from on high; and on the emotional side, lessons of industry, perseverance, fidelity, courage, sacrifice, and kindness of heart, of which the New Church certainly has no monopoly. But the New Church cannot look outside of the Word and the Writings for its *philosophy* of the universe, for its religious instruction, or for its moral standards. In the Writings of Swedenborg, the Lord has given to the world the essential means to a new understanding of Him and of His Word, an understanding absolutely indispensable to the rational man, if he is to continue a religious man. The New Church in the world is that body of individuals who have been led by the Lord to recognize this fact, and so have been entrusted with the task of making the new light available for all men. There is no assumption of personal superiority in recognizing the obligation, and undertaking the task. Instead of saying: "We have no right to assume that we know more than other people," we should say: "We have been entrusted by the Lord with knowledge which is not ours and which we have no right to keep to ourselves or to expurgate and dilute to suit our con-

venience." A certain portion of our time must necessarily be given to careful study and interpretation of the Word and of the Writings, and a certain portion to study of the world about us and its ideas; but if we stop there, we leave untouched the most important part of our task, the constructive application of the doctrines of the Second Advent to the problems of our age.

Relying on the Lord, let us proceed boldly in the conquest of the Holy Land. But in our attack upon Jericho, if we wish for success, let us follow the Lord's instructions, not being afraid to take the ark with us nor to sound the trumpets before it; and let us be careful to devote to the service of the Lord the precious things we find in Jericho, and not to yield to the temptation to make the silver and gold and the "goodly Babylonish garment" our own, lest we be defeated at Ai.

Anita S. Dole.

SWEDENBORG'S INFLUENCE IN AMERICA TO 1830

By Clarence Hotson, Ph.D.[1]

SWEDENBORG himself made no effort to found an organization for spreading his teachings, nor had he, apparently, any idea of originating or establishing church organizations or institutions of any kind. Yet with conditions as they were in the religious world of his day, some such organization as has actually occurred was inevitable. Even those of his followers who were willing to continue their allegiance to the particular denominational churches in which his message found them were frequently expelled for heresy where conscience was legally free, and persecuted where it was not. His followers, however, believing as they did that they had a new and vital gospel for the whole world, could not be content to remain in organizations devoted to furthering a different cause.

From England came the men and the books that were to introduce Swedenborg's doctrines into America. The New Church organization in this country, however, was a native product, and in no sense a branch of the organization in England.

The first New-Church society in North America was established in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in 1791.[2] It was led by Dr. Joseph Russell, who later went to New York City, and had the distinction of being the first disciple of Swedenborg in that city.

Before this time, however, James Glen gave a lecture in

[1]Acknowledgments are due to Reverend Frederic R. Crownfield, instructor in church history at the New-Church Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., for help in checking the statements in this paper.

[2]Hindmarsh, "Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church," 139; *N. J. Mag.*, 44:289.

Philadelphia, June 5, 1784, in Bell's Book Store, on Third Street. After two more lectures, June 11 and 12, he went to Boston, where he lectured at the "Green Dragon Tavern." Then, apparently discouraged at the small results of his efforts, he went back to Demarara.[3]

Glen's was the first public proclamation by the living voice of Swedenborg's doctrines in America or anywhere else, if we except Beyer's and Rosén's defense in Sweden. Soon after Glen's departure, a box of New-Church books, addressed to him by Robert Hindmarsh, arrived in Philadelphia. As Mr. Glen's whereabouts were unknown, the books were sold at public auction, and the writings of Swedenborg were thus introduced into America.

Soon some of the readers of these books in Philadelphia began to meet at the house of Francis Bailey, a printer, who had heard Glen lecture. Other hearers of Glen in Philadelphia, who later became converts, were John Young, Myers Fisher, and Thomas Vickroy, of Johnstown, Pa., who later surveyed and planned the present site of Pittsburgh. Later Miss Hetty Barclay, among others in Philadelphia, was converted, and she soon afterward introduced the writings in Bedford, Pa. Lancaster, Pa., was evangelized by William Reichenbach, from Saxony.[4]

James Glen had become acquainted with Swedenborg's teachings through reading a copy of "Heaven and Hell" on a ship voyage in 1781. He went to London in 1783, presumably to hunt out other readers, and he found there the Hindmarsh group and attended the advertised meeting in December, 1783. Besides his trips to Philadelphia and Boston, and his activities there, he made a journey to Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky, which, because by way of Pennsylvania, probably preceded his Boston visit.[5]

---

[3] *New-Church Review*, 1912, 550; *N. J. Mag.*, 30:391; 44:289; *New Jerusalem Messenger*, New York, 1855-1904, 47:130.

[4] *N. J. Mag.*, 44:289; *Mess.*, 34:70.

[5] *N. C. Rev.*, 1912, 549; Hindmarsh, 17; *N. J. Mag.*, 8:214; 30:391, 420; 11:119; Goyder "History," 11; *Mess.*, 47 (1884):130.

Glen was probably present May 7, 1787, at the London meeting, and certainly attended the preparatory meeting, July 19, 1787, for Hindmarsh's separatist society, where he presented a carefully prepared declaration of principles. He also attended the formal inauguration of the new society, July 31, 1787. He was present September 3 and 6, 1787. He went to Amsterdam, and was there on June 2, 1787.[6]

Later Glen formed a group in Demarara, where he baptized, and administered the Holy Supper. He distributed books. His correspondence may be partially collected from the *New-Church Review*, 19:532-572, where his character and life are described. He died September 9, 1814.[7]

In Boston, two of Glen's hearers afterward became converts to the new doctrines: Mr. Joseph Roby, a bookseller, and Major Joseph Hiller, of Salem, Mass.

In 1787 Francis Bailey in Philadelphia printed for gratuitous distribution "A Summary View of the Heavenly Doctrines," the first New-Church book published in America.

Closely associated with Francis Bailey, who was the proprietor of *The Freeman's Journal* of Philadelphia, was the poet of nature and liberty, Philip Freneau, editor of the *Journal*. He composed a poem in praise of the "True Christian Religion," copies of which Bailey must have been receiving from England and trying to sell in Philadelphia. The poem "On the Honourable Emanuel Swedenborg's Universal Theology," was reprinted in the 1788 collection of Freneau's poems, and in the later edition of 1809. It first appeared in *The Freeman's Journal*, October 4, 1786. An advertisement of "True Christian Religion" appeared in *The Freeman's Journal* for October 25, 1786.

I reproduce first, with no important change, a reprint of Freneau's poem which appeared in the *New Magazine of Knowledge*, II: 319-20 (1791):

---

[6] *New Church Repository*, New York, 1849, 19, 555-7; Hindmarsh, 57-8.

[7] *New Magazine of Knowledge*, 156; *Intellectual Repository*, 1814-15: 445 ff; *New Church Life*, 1895, 105, 120.

In this choice work the curious eye may find
The noblest system to reform mankind;
Old truths confirmed, that sceptics have denied,
By most perverted, and which some deride.

Here, truths divine in heavenly visions grow
From the vast *influx* on our world below;
Here, like the blaze of our material sun,
Enlightened Reason proves, that God is One,—
As *that,* concentered in itself, a sphere,
Illumes all Nature with its radiance here,
Bids towards itself all trees and plants aspire,
Awakes the winds, impels the seeds of fire,
And, still subservient to the Almighty plan,
Warms into life the changeful race of man;
So—like that sun in heaven's bright realms we trace
One Power of Love, that fills unbounded space,
Existing always by no borrowed aid,
Before all worlds—eternal, and not made—
To That indebted, stars and comets burn,
Owe their first movement, and to That return!
Prime source of wisdom, all-contriving mind,
First spring of Reason, that this globe designed;
Upholds the fabric that his wisdom planned,
And, its due course assigned to every sphere,
Revolves the seasons, and sustains the year:
Pure light of Truth! where'er thy rays combine
Thou art the substance of the power divine;
Nought else on earth that full resemblance bears,
No sun, that lights us through our circling years,
No stars, that through yon' heavenly mansions stray,
No moon, that glads us with her evening ray,
No seas, that o'er their gloomy mansions flow,
No forms beyond us, and no shapes below!

Then slight—ah slight not, this instructive page
For the low follies of a thoughtless age;
Here to the truth, by Reason's aid aspire,
Here the gay visions of the blest admire;
Behold that heaven, in these neglected lines,
In whose vast space perpetual daylight shines;
Where streams of joy through plains of pleasure run
And night is banished from so bright a sun.

Plunged in that gulph, whose dark unfathomed wave
All tongues and nations to destruction gave,

Here, man no more disgraced by death appears
Lost in dull slumbers thro' a waste of years—
No empty dream, or still more empty shade,
Remains the substance, but the form decayed;
Sees what he saw, knows what before was known,
The same ideas, but more perfect grown.
Where parted souls with kindred spirits meet,
Wrapt to the bloom of beauty all complete;
In that celestial, vast unbounded sphere,
Nought there exists but has its image here!
All there is Mind!—That Intellectual Flame,
From whose vast stores Platonic visions came,
In which creation ended and began—
Flows to this abject world, and beams on Man!

A comparison with the version in the edition of 1809, copied from the "Poems of Philip Freneau,"[8] is instructive:

In this choice work, with wisdom penned, we find
The noblest systems to reform mankind;
Bold truths confirmed, that bigots have denied,
By most perverted, and which some deride.
Here, truths divine in easy language flow,
Truths long concealed, that now all climes shall know.
Here, like the blaze of our material sun,
Enlightened Reason proves, that God is One,—
As that, concentered in itself, a sphere,
Illumes all Nature with its radiance here,
Bids towards itself all trees and plants aspire,
Awakes the winds, impels the seeds of fire,
And still subservient to the Almighty plan,
Warms into life the changeful race of man;
So—like that sun in heaven's bright realms we trace
One Power of Love, that fills unbounded space,
Existing always by no borrowed aid,
Before all worlds—eternal, and not made—
To That indebted, stars and comets burn,
Owe their swift movements, and to That return!
Prime source of wisdom, all-contriving mind,
First spring of Reason, that this globe designed;
Parent of order, whose unwearied hand
Upholds the fabric that his wisdom planned,

[8]Edited by Fred Lewis Pattee, Princeton University Library, 1903, in 3 volumes, 116, 307.

And, its due course assigned to every sphere,
Revolves the seasons, and sustains the year!
Pure light of Truth! where'er thy splendors shine,
Thou art the image of the power divine;
Nought else, in life, that full resemblance bears,
No sun, that lights us through our circling years,
No stars, that through yon' charming azure stray,
No seas, that o'er their gloomy caverns flow,
No forms beyond us, and no shapes below!
Then slight—ah slight not, this instructive page
For the mean follies of a dreaming age;
Here to the truth, by Reason's aid aspire,
Nor some dull preacher of romance admire;
See One, Sole God, in these convincing lines,
Beneath whose view perpetual daylight shines;
At whose command all worlds their circuits run,
And night, retiring, dies before the sun!
Here, Man no more disgraced by time appears,
Lost in dull slumbers through ten thousand years,
Plunged in that gulf, whose dark unfathomed wave
Men of all ages to perdition gave;
An empty dream, or still more empty shade,
The substance vanished, and the form decayed:—
Here Reason proves, that when this life decays,
Instant, new life in the warm bosom plays,
As that expiring still, its course repairs
Through endless ages, and unceasing years.
Where parted souls with kindred spirits meet,
Wrapt to the bloom of beauty all complete;
In that celestial, vast unclouded sphere,
Nought there exists but has its image here!
All there is Mind!—That Intellectual Flame,
From whose vast stores all human genius came,
In which all Nature forms on Reason's plan—
Flows to this abject world, and beams on Man!

In 1789 Francis Bailey published one volume of "True Christian Religion," in separate numbers, after having obtained fifty subscribers, among them Benjamin Franklin and Robert Morris. The second volume appeared in 1792.[9]

John Young, one of Glen's hearers in Philadelphia, and perhaps the earliest disciple of Swedenborg in the United

[9]The list of subscribers was printed at the end of Volume II.

States, planted the doctrines in the West. Born at Glasgow, July 12, 1762, he studied law in the office of Sir Walter Scott's father, emigrated to America in 1777, and entered the legal profession at Philadelphia in 1784. He was at once converted by Glen's lecture, and read through the "Arcana Cœlestia," which he borrowed from Glen. He was the first person in America to order "True Christian Religion" from England. He lent his copy to Francis Bailey, for the purpose of enabling him to get out an American edition, and secured subscriptions from Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, and other noted persons. He was active in Philadelphia, in making proselytes, married a fellow believer in 1789, and located as a lawyer in Westmoreland County. He was a captain of militia against the Indians, in 1795. He was appointed presiding judge of Western Pennsylvania, in 1806, and served with distinction till 1837. He supplied "Johnny Appleseed" (of whom I treat later on) with the New-Church literature which that missionary distributed among the early settlers in Ohio, and he otherwise contributed greatly to spread these teachings in the district west of the Alleghanies. He read the Scriptures and the Writings in the original tongues, and was considered, next to J. Condy, of Philadelphia, the most intelligent New-Church layman of that age.[10]

In 1790 Lord Thomas Fairfax of Alexandria, Virginia, and Dr. John J. Cabell, of Nelson County, were converted. Colonel Robert Carter, of Lancaster County, Virginia, became a convert in this year, and freed his slaves thereupon.[11]

Baltimore had the first New-Church society in the United States. April 1, 1792, Reverend James Wilmer, an Episcopal clergyman, educated at Oxford, preached in that city the first "Swedenborgian" sermon in America. A society

[10] *Newchurchman*, Philadelphia, I:76; III:231.

[11] *Mess.*, 57:187; 58:8; 60:281; 63:9. For. Col. Carter's part in publishing the first New-Church liturgy, see *New-Church Review*, 35:391.

of twenty-two members formed, using Proud's liturgy, which Carter reprinted and gave them. The Methodists in Baltimore were their bitterest opponents. The society sent President Washington a copy of "True Christian Religion," with a complimentary address, January 22, 1793, which he acknowledged with excellent courtesy.[12]

Colonel Robert Carter moved to Baltimore in 1792, and joined the society there. Mr. Wilmer published "A Sermon on the Doctrine of the New Jerusalem Church," the first New-Church sermon published in the United States, and dedicated it to Colonel Carter. In 1795, however, Mr. Wilmer, discouraged, went back to the Episcopal Church. Robert Carter kept up worship in his own house, where he preached and administered baptism and the Holy Supper. He corresponded with Ralph Mather, who was by this time active in Philadelphia; and among Carter's papers are records of visits by Mather to Baltimore, on which occasions Mr. Mather preached and baptized.[13]

Reverend Ralph Mather, of Liverpool, had settled in 1792 in Germantown, near Philadelphia, where he started regular meetings for worship. He led, in 1794, New-Church meetings in Philadelphia, and baptized converts. In 1795 he occasionally visited the society in Baltimore, after Wilmer left it. In the same year Adam Fonerden, a former Methodist preacher, was converted.[14]

Baron Heinrich von Bülow, brother of the Waterloo General, settled at Lancaster, Pa., and actively propagated the doctrines, beginning in 1796.[15]

In Bath, Maine, in 1792, Dr. Cummings, a Baptist clergyman, introduced the doctrines, and Mr. Allen, of Bath, was

---

[12]Hindmarsh, 150-155.

[13]*Mess.,* 1856, 186; 47:186, 62:249, 403, 415; *Congressional Library* (for Wilmer's sermon); *N. J. Mag.,* 43:47.

[14]*N. J. Mag.,* 43:477; 44:178; 14:183; *New Church Life,* Philadelphia, I:72, 399-402.

[15]*New Church Life,* Philadelphia, II:40; *Mess.,* 47:39; *New Jerusalem Magazine,* new series, xvii:145, 304.

converted. Gradually a society formed in Bath, was formally organized in 1829, and still exists. The beginnings of a society in Portland, Maine, were in 1824.[16]

In 1797 Colonel Carter reorganized the Baltimore society to save it, as he did not like the interest of some of its members in "animal magnetism" and similar subjects. The purge, or operation, was successful, but the patient died, for the society broke up.[17]

In the same year, however, Reverend John Hargrove, a Methodist preacher, settled in Baltimore. He was born in Ireland in 1750, emigrated to America in 1769, joined the Methodists in 1777, and was ordained in 1795 by Bishop Asbury. Through making the acquaintance of Ralph Mather and Colonel Carter, he became a convert to the New-Church doctrines. When he first heard of them, in 1793, he began to study them for the purpose of refuting them, but in a few years' time they converted him.[18]

June 5, 1798, Hargrove and Fonerden published a "Valedictory Address to the People Called Methodists," which broke with them over the doctrine of the Trinity. Hargrove on leaving them necessarily gave up his employment as a teacher, and with it his means of support of a wife and eight children, but he was encouraged in fidelity to his new principles by his wife. Fonerden later relapsed, but Hargrove persisted. June 27, 1798, a new society was organized in Baltimore, with him as president. It was decided to ordain Mather and Hargrove, both former Methodist preachers. This was done July 8, by "ten elders" of the society, according to the form adopted by Hindmarsh's group in London. On Sunday, January 5, 1800, a New-Church Temple which had been erected, the first in America, was consecrated in Baltimore. October 2 of that year Mrs. Hargrove died of yellow fever, which

[16] *Mess.*, 52:70, 38:255; *Convention Journal*, 1828, 5; 1829: 4; 1830: 8; *N. J. Mag.*, 30:207-8; *N. J. Mag.*, new series, V:475.

[17] *Mess.*, 63:59, 139.

[18] *N. J. Mag.*, 14:488.

then raged in Baltimore. About forty families joined in a year's time after the opening of the Temple.[19]

Friction between the two ministers, Mather, the earlier in the field, and Hargrove, the leading spirit in the Baltimore society, naturally developed, and led to the removal of Mather, who went to France, and Hargrove remained as sole pastor. Mather returned from France in 1802, and died in Norfolk, Virginia. In 1804 John Hargrove married Mather's widow. Hargrove remained until 1812 the only New-Church minister in America.[20]

Hargrove preached on December 25th, 1804, before the Senate and Congress of the United States, and gave two discourses before the General Assembly of the State of Maryland. Late in 1806, he completed a missionary journey of five hundred miles through Pennsylvania and vicinity, visited Judge Young at Greensburgh, and at Brownsville baptized nearly forty persons. His society increased considerably in numbers, especially after 1817. He was elected the first President of Convention, and was re-elected ten times to this office. He is recognized as the source of all subsequent ordinations in the American church. From 1808 to 1824 he held the office of City Registrar of Baltimore. April 17, 1830, at the age of eighty, he resigned his pastoral charge, and was given the use of the parsonage for the rest of his natural life, which ended December 6, 1839.[21]

At Philadelphia in 1806 there were about twenty converts. These began to hold meetings for conversation at the schoolroom of Mr. Johnston Taylor, a zealous disciple. Then they met at the schoolroom of Mr. Maskill M. Carll,

---

[19]*N. J. Mag.*, 14:489, 43:546, 553; 44:285; Hindmarsh, 176, 181; *Mess.*, 62:260.

[20]*N. J. Mag.*, 44:285; for Mather's biography, *New Church Life*, 1896:154, 168.

[21]Hindmarsh, 181, footnote; 187; *N. J. Mag.*, 14:485-491; *N. J. Mag.*, new series, xvii:1; *The Precursor*, Cincinnati, 1837-40, III:43.

who led the services. William Schlatter, a particularly ardent New-Church missionary in Philadelphia, published editions of some of Swedenborg's writings for gratuitous distribution, and even put them in boxes of merchandise which he sent out. January 1, 1816, a public notice in the daily press announced the institution of a new society, and invited communications from readers. This notice was sent out by an association for disseminating the doctrines. *The New Jerusalem Church Repository* (quarterly) was started, and went through eight numbers, after which it died for want of support, with the number for October, 1818. December 25, 1816, saw the organization of the first Philadelphia church, and the ordination of Mr. Carll by Hargrove, upon which occasion Carll was at once given ordaining power.[22]

In 1816, however, Mr. William Metcalf settled in Philadelphia with a following of "Bible Christians," disciples of William Cowherd. They organized an independent church, which still exists. March 24, 1816, Cowherd died, and Robert Hindmarsh in his "Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church" attributed his death to his religious vegetarianism, if not also to his abstinence from the cup that cheers.[23]

The zealous William Schlatter furnished the money for building the first New-Church Temple in Philadelphia, which was consecrated January 1, 1817. The first Convention was held in Philadelphia, May 15-17, 1817, with about twenty visitors present, from New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Scotland, and Sweden. Philadelphia now had fifty-five members. November 1, 1817, Francis Bailey, the first convert to and promoter of

[22] *Convention Journal*, 1817, 134; *Mess.*, 33:195; Odhner, "Annals of the New Church," 245; Hindmarsh, 266-281; *N. J. Mag.*, 27:561; 44:394.

[23] J. Bayley, *New Church Worthies*, 145; Hindmarsh, 148, 194-5, 199; Goyder "History," 69, 109; *Intellectual Repository*, 1837: 626, 1838: 69, 81, 150.

the doctrines in America, died. The leading mind in the Philadelphia church was Jonathan W. Condy. In 1822 an Episcopalian clergyman published a violent attack on the New-Church teachings, and Reverend Manning B. Roche, another Episcopalian, was converted to them, and afterward built up a strong society that temporarily eclipsed the First Church in Philadelphia.[24]

A notable New-Church pioneer in America was William Hill (1762-1804), who was converted in London, in 1787, through reading books in the possession of Reverend Jacob Duché. Hill was a man of means, able to follow his own bent. He devoted himself to the study and propagation of Swedenborg's teachings. He studied theology under John Clowes, who called him his son. Though he served the Liverpool Society as minister after Mather left it in 1792, Hill was not ordained. In 1794 he went to America, and resided, at first, in or near Boston, where he published a number of New-Church works. He came to America for no other purpose than to disseminate the doctrines of Swedenborg. He gained the esteem of influential people, including President Kirkland of Harvard, and deposited a set of the original Latin edition of the "Arcana Cœlestia" in the Library of Harvard College, July 11, 1794. By exchange, this set is now in the possession of the New-Church Theological School. He was invited to preach from a number of pulpits in and around Boston. Four proselytes in Boston resulted from his efforts, largely through social contacts. Hill also visited Baltimore, where he was later offered (by Carter) the pastorate, which he declined (October 18, 1796), as he, like his preceptors Duché and Clowes, was a non-separatist. He visited Philadelphia and New York. He returned to England in 1796, but the next year again went to Philadelphia, where he renewed his intimacy with Mr. Duché, whose daughter Esther he married, June 2, 1797. On his first trip to

[24]Hindmarsh, 285; *Mess.*, 32:72; *Convention Journal*, 1823: 17; *Intellectual Repository*, 1823: 416.

America he visited New York, and deposited Swedenborg's works in Columbia University. He made acquaintances, and propagated the doctrines. On his second visit to America he revisited Cambridge in 1798. He again visited Boston, 1801-1802, and spent the summer in Hingham. He returned to Philadelphia, and on a farm nearby he finished his translation of the "*Apocalypsis Explicata.*" He died in Philadelphia, June 2, 1804. In Cambridge his willingness to dance, though he was engaged in preaching and was always considered to be a clergyman, excited some frivolous comment.[25]

The first disciple of Swedenborg in New York City was Dr. Joseph Russell, who had led the circle in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The first New-Church circle in New York City started its meetings in 1793. It consisted of Dr. Russell and the families of Bragg and Mott, from Birmingham, and Banks, from Norwich, England. In 1795, Mr. Hill, then residing in "the neat Dutch village of Flat Bush," in a letter to Fonerden, August 3, said that New York was unfavorable territory for the doctrines. But he advertised the Writings in the newspapers, and placed copies in the various public libraries. December 22, 1805, a reading circle was organized. In 1811 a society was organized at a meeting held in a schoolhouse, and Sunday worship begun. January 1, 1812, saw the publication of *The Halcyon Luminary*, by Samuel Woodworth, the poet, author of "The Old Oaken Bucket." Associated with him in the enterprise were "a society of gentlemen" of New York and Boston. The periodical, devoted to religion and polite literature, had over three thousand subscribers during the first year, and proved effective in spreading the doctrines. It resulted notably in the conversion of Dr. Lewis Beers, of Danby, Tioga County, N. Y., who in 1814 openly

[25] *N. J. Mag.*, 30:391-4, 473; 14:182-7, 221-3; Sampson Reed, "Biographical Sketch of Thomas Worcester," 1-6.

announced his conversion. The Universalist congregation continued for the most part to attend his services.[26]

Woodworth was vice-president of the New York branch of the association for the dissemination of the doctrines. In 1817 he conducted public worship in a schoolroom on Broadway. The services were attended by fifty or sixty persons. Mr. Beers formed a couple of small societies at Danby and Spencer, and was ordained by Mr. Carll. Mr. Doughty was ordained in 1818 for the New York Society. July 1, 1821, the new Temple of this society was consecrated. In 1823 appeared the monthly *New Jerusalem Missionary,* edited by Samuel Woodworth. He died December 9, 1842.[27]

In the West, Jonathan Chapman, "Johnny Appleseed" (1775?-1847), who was an odd character, a primitive New-Church evangelist, had begun in 1801 to traverse the new settlements in Southern Ohio, distributing apple-seed, planting philanthropic orchards for new settlers to enjoy, and circulating Swedenborg's writings, torn up into sections for wider distribution. His labors continued for many years, and resulted in numerous converts.[28]

Another New-Church missionary in the West was Adam Hurdus, born near Manchester, England, in 1760. In his youth he served in the British navy, was captured by the French, and served many years in military prison in France. When liberated, he went into business in Manchester, was converted by reading John Wesley's fulminations against Swedenborg in his *Arminian Magazine,* and joined Rever-

---

[26]*New Church Life,* I: 401; *Mess.,* 1856, 159; 21:252; 24:225; 47:144; *N. J. Mag.,* 14:185; Hindmarsh, 221; *New Church Repository,* 1849: 485.

[27]Hindmarsh, 273; *Convention Journal,* 1817; 134, 142; 1821: 6, 1826: 14; *New Jerusalem Church Repository,* Philadelphia, 1817, 127; *Mess.,* 63:89, 137, 157, 203; *N. J. Mag.,* new series, viii:28, 140.

[28]*Mess.,* 24:108; 36:58; 45:10, 290; 55:185; 58:204; 61:83, 88; *Convention Journal,* 1822: 8; *Harper's Monthly Magazine,* November, 1871.

end John Clowes. He soon afterward became a separatist, joining the Peter Street Society. He came from Manchester first to Philadelphia, in 1804, then to Pittsburgh, and finally, to Cincinnati, where in 1808 he conducted New-Church worship in his own house, built with his own hands the first organ in Cincinnati, and attracted Indians, as well as white people, to his services. In 1811 he organized a society with seventeen members. In 1816 he was baptized and ordained by Hargrove, at Baltimore, July 28. He died August 30, 1843. There is a biography of him by A. G. W. Carter (New York, 1865).[29]

Converts in Boston and in New England generally were made with extreme slowness until 1817. Hill's work had resulted in some converts, but nothing much was done until the conversion of Samuel Worcester, through his reading of some books which Hill had left with Mr. Edward Dowse, in the winter of 1814-15. Samuel Worcester was then teaching school at Dedham. He diligently sought out other readers in Boston and vicinity, and got them together in the spring of 1817 at 12 Cornhill, later (1880) 94 and 96 Washington Street. Ten persons were present, among them Thomas Worcester. Fortnightly meetings were held afterward at a house at 362 Washington Street, where the Globe Theatre was later (1880) located. Probably at this time not thirty persons in all Massachusetts were interested in Swedenborg's teaching.[30]

In 1816 Thomas Worcester searched for the set of "*Arcana Cœlestia*" which William Hill had left in Harvard College Library, and Sampson Reed quotes him as describing the experience:

> At that time the library was in the second story of the west end of Harvard Hall. In the east end was a large room, called the

[29] *N. J. Mag.*, 17:76; 43:550; *Intellectual Repository*, 1812: 201; *The Precursor*, Cincinnati, 1837-40, II:79; *The Newchurchman Extra*, 97.

[30] *N. J. Mag.*, 11:120; *50th Ann. Boston Soc.*, 16; Reed, "Worcester," 16.

"Philosophical Room." And between this room and the library was a small room, which for the want of a proper name was called the "Museum." It was filled with rubbish, old curiosities, cast off, superseded, and obsolete philosophical apparatus, and so forth, all covered with dust. . . . There was a long table in the room. Upon it, and under it, were piles of useless articles; and beyond it were shelves against the wall, where various things were stored away. On the under shelf, as far out of sight as possible, I saw some books. I told the librarian, and he went around and worked his way until he got at them, and found that the large books were volumes of the *"Arcana Cœlestia."* There were also several other works of Swedenborg, all of them covered with dust. I immediately got an order from President Kirkland, giving me authority to take the books and keep them in my room; and this I did for the rest of my college life. . . . Of the 50,000 or 60,000 volumes then belonging to the library, these were the only ones that were treated in this manner.[31]

Of the twelve persons who in 1818 organized the Boston Society, Mr. Joseph Roby was the earliest convert. He became acquainted with the doctrines in 1784, through Mr. Glen's visit and lectures. He was quite an old man when the Society started, and lived only a year or two afterward. Dr. James Mann, a physician, also a proselyte of Hill's, was seventy years old at this time. Miss Margaret G. Cary, by 1787, had been reading Swedenborg's books for over a year. Mr. T. B. Hayward was another notable of the original twelve.[32]

At a meeting held at Dr. Mann's house, May 24, 1817, the members decided to communicate with the Church in Philadelphia. August 15, 1818, Reverend M. M. Carll, of Philadelphia, was present at the formal organization of the New-Church Society in Boston. Mr. Thomas Worcester was chosen leader. On the following day, Sunday, the public worship of the New Church was conducted for the first time in New England. The Boston Society worshipped in various halls until 1831, when it moved to a chapel in Phillips Place, built for it by Timothy H. Carter. This

[31]I. e., cast out as described. Reed, "Worcester," 17-18; cf. *N. J. Mag., 2:367*; 11:122.

[32]Reed, "Worcester," 20.

chapel was in a part of what is now Houghton & Dutton's store. The Society moved, in June, 1845, at the meeting of Convention, to its present building on Bowdoin Street.[33]

In the year 1818 Harvard graduated two young men, both later prominent in the history of the New Church: Thomas Worcester and Sampson Reed. Among the undergraduates prominent in the later history of the church were Theophilus Parsons, and Nathaniel Hobart, author of the first biography of Swedenborg. In 1822 these young men organized a literary "evidence" society, which held weekly meetings until 1824. In 1823 the Boston Society incorporated with forty members. By 1830 it had eighty members.[34]

In 1821 Thomas Worcester was invited to become the minister of the Boston Society. His ordination was delayed for seven years thereafter, because of his introduction in 1820 of an idea which was called his "conjugial heresy"; or, inasmuch as he and his brother Samuel spread it to the members of the Boston Society, the "Boston principle." They held that there is a peculiar "conjugial" relation between a pastor and his society, corresponding to the relation between the Lord and the Church in general. "Close communion" resulted as a logical consequence of this doctrine, and also a certain indissoluble relation between a pastor and each member of his flock. This doctrine introduced great disturbance and controversy, which lasted for a number of years. The brothers Worcester championed the idea, and many other New-Church leaders opposed it, including Robert Hindmarsh and John Clowes. After the controversy had somewhat subsided, Thomas Worcester was or-

[33] *Conv. J.*, 1817: 144; 1832: 6; *Mess.*, 47:131; Hindmarsh, 303; *N. J. Mag.*, 7:722; 30:538; *N. J. Mag.*, new series, 11:359, 364; *New Jerusalem Church Repository*, October, 1818; *50 Ann. Boston Society*; address of John Worcester, *75th Anniversary, Boston Society.*

[34] *N. J. Mag.*, 5:37; 18:208; 19:239; 34:292; *N. J. Mag.*, new series, xvi:569; *Convention Journal*, 1823: 19; Reed, "Worcester," 57.

dained, and on his ordination, August 17, 1828, he was at once given the highest rank, that of ordaining minister. This ordination followed upon the Convention of 1828, held at Boston, the first Convention to be held in New England, the growing importance of which section in the New Church was by this means signalized.[35]

The doctrines of Swedenborg, once planted, spread apace in New England. Reverend Holland Weeks, a popular Congregational pastor, though trained under Presbyterian auspices, became a convert, and soon attracted more attention to his preaching in Abington, Mass., where his popularity increased until he acknowledged that his ideas were from Swedenborg, whereupon he was in 1820 tried for heresy, deprived of his position, and excommunicated. Several pamphlets were published during the year in regard to this trial. The case gained widespread attention, and is said to have resulted ultimately in the establishment of four different New-Church societies in Massachusetts: Abington (1835), Bridgewater (1833), North Bridgewater (Brockton) (1838), and East Bridgewater (1838). Weeks, baptized and ordained by Mr. Carll, went on a missionary journey in Virginia, and baptized sixty converts. He labored in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York for a few years, after which, owing to ill health and advanced age, he returned to his farm, near Henderson, N. Y., where he died in 1843.[36]

In August, 1829, Otis Clapp, J. F. Hinkley, and Charles D. Taft were excommunicated by orthodox (Congregationalist, Calvinist) churches in Boston for their "Swedenborgianism"; and for the same reason, in 1830, Warren Bird, a Baptist minister, was similarly excommunicated.[37]

[35] *New Jerusalem Missionary,* 1823, I:162; *New Church Life,* IV:20-124; *N. J. Mag.,* 2:31; 19:177; Reed, "Worcester," 50; *Conv. Journal,* 1828: 1842: 420.

[36] *Mess.,* 46:291; 64:110; *N. J. Mag.,* 12:217; 17:80; 28:339; *Convention Journal,* 1821; 1826: 13; 1827: 26; 1828: 6; 1833: 14; 1844: 424; *The Newchurchman, Extra,* 151.

[37] *N. J. Mag.,* 2:379; *Conv. Journal,* 1830.

Around the Boston Church grew up other groups which, together with Boston, were soon to dominate Convention, to the discontent chiefly of the Philadelphia Church. By 1828 the center of New-Church activity had shifted from Philadelphia to Boston. Boston's "conjugial heresy" was resented, and also, as early as 1823, William Schlatter of Philadelphia charged Boston with reading Swedenborg "not for authority but for instruction." The Philadelphia Church as a whole, in controversy with the Boston leaders, upheld the "absolute authority" of the writings of Swedenborg as constituting Divine Revelation.

The question of "authority" was only one of the points on which controversy arose. In general, differences of opinion have concerned the nature of the ministry, missionary effort, doctrinal questions, and the development of an organization.[38]

The Convention of 1823 made Convention a representative body, giving delegates to each church, not to exceed three in number. The Conventions took up the question of ordination and of church order in general. In 1826 Convention took into its own hands the ordaining power, by providing that ordaining ministers should act as agents of Convention. In 1831 Convention was further defined as consisting of ministers and those holding a license to preach, *ex officiis*, and delegates from the regularly organized societies.

In 1827 appeared at Boston the first number of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, a publication which continued for many years, and was long the only important organ of "Swedenborgianism" in America. It was succeeded in 1894 by the *New-Church Review* (quarterly).[39]

Zealous missionary work resulted in considerable growth in membership. In 1820 the New Church in the United States numbered twelve societies, eight ordained ministers,

---

[38]*The New Churchman, Extra*, Appendix, xli; *Conv. J.*, 1826: 22; 1828: 10; *The Newchurchman, Extra*, 166-177.

[39]*Conv. R.*, 1823, 1826, 1828: 6.

and about 230 members. The Census for 1830 gives the New Church a membership of 500 persons with 28 societies, 16 ordained ministers, and seven temples.[40]

The great interest of New-Church people in the homeopathic system of medicine, which has continued, began in 1825.[41] The homeopathic pharmacists, Boericke and Tafel of Philadelphia, and Otis Clapp of Boston, were New-Churchmen.

CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D.

University of Minnesota.

---

[40] *N. J. Mag.*, new series, VI:440; *Mess.*, 47:283; *N. J. Mag.*, 6:44.

[41] *Mess.*, 39:168; *New Church Life*, 1898: 27.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE PROBLEM OF YOUNG PEOPLE

Broadly speaking there is no problem of young people,—no specific and peculiar problem. What we have to deal with is *the problem of the age* in which we live: the problem of dealing with irreligion, with immorality, with lawlessness, with self-seeking, and with pernicious philosophies. Self-seeking and lawlessness come from unrestrained and uncontrolled natural impulses and desires; immorality and irreligion are grounded in human nature, and fortified by individualistic and naturalistic philosophies. We cannot deal with this problem of the age without an adequate knowledge of human nature and of these philosophies. We cannot deal with the problem of young people apart from the problem of the age; and this means that we must know what the problem of the age is.

Modern life is exceedingly complicated; and it is getting more and more international. What we call "Western Civilization" is extending to all parts of the world,—to China, to India, and now to the interior of Africa. The problem of the age is therefore in large and increasing measure the problem of western civilization. The immense development of corporate industry, technological methods, and far-reaching organization, in particular the enormous growth of corporations, have given our life a dominant mechanical and commercial trend. An individual who has a place in the system is well provided for at the time; but when he drops out from sickness, or old age, or other infirmity, he is left a hopeless burden upon society or friends. This, together with actual forms of injustice and inhumanity incident to the efficient working of the system, and its crushing weight upon men of all grades within and without, stirs resentment and re-action against the oppressive and inexorable conditions of the life of the age.

This re-actionary temper is re-enforced by the attitude towards tradition, which is also felt to be artificial, if not arbitrary and falsely grounded. In the western world, re-action against tradition has been stimulated and fortified by certain historical episodes. In the Renaissance of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there was more or less re-action against the traditions of the Church. This re-action was intensified and directed against the Roman Catholic Church by the Protestant Reformation. The development of the natural sciences, beginning with astronomy, mathematics, and physics, has aroused deep opposition to religion; and this opposition has extended the re-actionary spirit and habit against all religion, especially against the Christian religion. The influences of the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, and the scientific revolution developed a philosophy which upset or challenged the whole body of tradition, and made nature and man the sole field of reality. What we have to deal with, then, is the re-actionary temper of the age, manifested in books and periodicals, in the schools, on the forum and on the stage, in common talk, in morals and in religion, and in philosophies; and this proceeds from many forms of unenlightened and undirected self-assertion.

In this context the minds of all, both young and old, are involved. Our problem is, therefore, to extricate the New-Church mind and life from the burden of this context, so as to give distinctiveness and freedom of development. To begin with, we have the Humanism of the day—the substitution of the worship of humanity for the worship of God—to dispose of. Humanism rests on the presupposition that man is independent and self-sufficient, if not self-existent. This premise is not submitted to searching question, but the implications are adopted as self-evident, and expressed in language so familiar that we seldom pause to reflect upon it. We all recognize as characteristic of the spirit of the age such forms of expression as: "I must live my own life"; "I must experience for myself whether a thing is good or bad"; "I must be guided by what is good for me, not by what may be good for somebody else"; "I must depend upon my own judgment as to right or wrong, and not

upon the dictate of any other, whether human or Divine"; "I must do my own thinking entirely free from the weight of inheritance or tradition"; "Traditional views, habits, interpretations, judgments, traditional moral codes, and religious dogma, have little or no weight with me; they are offensive and despicable"; "I want to be sincere, outspoken, frank, and unrestrained."

All these are expressions of the philosophy of radical individualism. They go back to the pleasure-for-pleasure's-sake doctrine of the Epicureans, to the extravagances of the humanistic Romanticists, and to evolutionistic naturalism. They all proceed on the assumption that man is in-and-of-himself good, and needs only to develop his native impulses, emotions and desires to realize his manhood and to secure the full measure of his happiness.

We are witnessing the working of these principles in the thought and conduct of the day; in the lawlessness, vice, and crime which are paraded before the public so indiscriminately in the press, and which have become an enormous tax and burden upon society. It may be the natural and inevitable accompaniment of the increase of population that these conditions have become exaggerated; but in any case they are a most disturbing problem of our civilization. We must recognize that they are the direct and indirect social consequences of our individualistic and naturalistic philosophies.

Our real and large problem, then, is not only to understand and control re-actionary tendencies and habits, but to substitute the principles of a spiritual and religious philosophy for those of a naturalistic humanism. This is a problem of the young people, and it is more; it is the problem of every man who is born into the world of the present day. This is the general situation; but there is a more concrete and individual situation.

Young people, by the very fact that they are young people, do have their own problems; and although these problems grow out of the complexities and the warring elements of human nature, and although we are all faced with these conditions, young people face them afresh, and therefore with them they are more stimulating and baffling. Fresh impulses, fresh emotions, fresh

desires, a teeming multitude of new ideas, crowd into the pulsating life of young people; and these are the special conditions which set their problems. Impulses, emotions, desires impel to action and to satisfaction; but by the limitations of finite life they cannot all be expressed at once. This forces the baffling problem of choosing which to express and which to restrain. Then, too, there is the inevitable and disturbing conflict of impulses and desires which compels not only choice but struggle. Thus life, especially young life, is a tumult of conflicting tendencies and forces; and out of this tumult must come order, organization, and direction, else the outcome will be failure, disappointment, and helpless misery. This is the ever-insistent problem of young people. They must work out the problem under the actual conditions; they must make use of their own resources; they must judge for themselves, and act accordingly; this is the requirement of free, rational life.

But what are their resources? To judge correctly and fruitfully, they must have standards; and to act safely, they must have vision of consequences. Their direct and limited experience does not of itself afford them this vision, nor does it furnish the standards. But they have larger resources than those of direct actual experience. They have begun life, normally, in the family circle, and gradually extended it to friends and community. With expanding knowledge by social intercourse, books, and schools, they acquire in varying measure the resources of science and history; they live in a context of tradition and custom; they have models and examples of life in biographies. In all these ways they get ideas and ideal principles and methods, which correspond more or less to their impulses and desires, and which arouse sentiments and ideals. These sentiments and ideals serve as standards by which to judge the quality and measure the importance of spontaneous impulses and desires. The danger here is that the insistent strength of the impulses and desires may overcome the force of the sentiments, and displace the ideals as standards. With the development of this struggle, the two groups—impulses and desires on the one hand and sentiments and ideals on the other—become consolidated in their opposition to each other, and the

harmony of the personal life is threatened. Out of this struggle antagonism arises between the natural spontaneous life and the life required by the standards which reflective and enlightened judgment has set up. Immediate satisfactions demand preference over the remote and the postponed. So we have the struggles of the spiritual and moral life.

The forces of modern life are largely determined by the exacting industrial and social conditions, and not by considerations of moral and spiritual well-being. Multitudes of men and women must find their jobs and keep them, or live as helpless burdens on others. Many deny themselves the comforts and enjoyments of moderate living in order to attain social position and influence. The effect of this is to blunt the moral sensibilities and spiritual perceptions, to center attention upon self-interest, and to make life a "struggle for the survival of the fittest" in the material world. These conditions excite and promote feelings of re-action against attempts to control self-seeking by principles and requirements which seem remote and antagonistic.

On a different level, and under the spell of modern science, the emotional and intellectual life of the day, as expressed in current literature, has appropriated certain philosophical interpretations of man and the universe which are made to contrast with, or to overturn, the morality and philosophy, and especially the religion, of tradition. Here again strong currents of re-action are set up which sweep through present-day thought and life with devastating effect. Religious and moral standards are questioned and rejected; truth is subjected to human opinion and convenience; subjective standards growing out of demands for free indulgence are set up, and styled aspirations and ideals; authority is renounced at the bidding of principles and presuppositions accepted without question or criticism, because they are the formulated demands for self-expression.

These forms of re-action, so potent in the spirit of the age, must be recognized, analyzed, and brought to the bar of enlightened judgment before any real freedom of thought and action can be exercised and enjoyed; otherwise, the freedom actually felt is only apparent and ominously delusive,—a free-

dom to oppose and reject, but not to appropriate and use for progress. In the pursuit of a rich and fully developed manhood, re-action and self-assertion are vain exercises. What modern life needs at the outset is relief from their burden, and to extricate itself from the network of consequences. To accomplish this we must appropriate, not renounce and reject, the past; then acquire a deeper knowledge of the present; and form more adequate ideas of what the future ought to be. There are, of course, progressive impulses, efforts, and achievements now, as there have been in the past; and it is of obvious importance that we appropriate these also.

This is the problem, the problem of young and old, inside and outside the New Church. But New-Churchmen have some peculiar and immensely important advantages. They have a more definite revealed doctrine about the universe, about God and man, than men have had in the past. They may learn this doctrine, and do their best to understand and apply it. As they make progress in this, they become better and better prepared to understand and meet the conditions of the day. The central fact which this body of doctrine reveals is, that the universe is Love,—Love in all its degrees and forms. The Lord is infinite Love, and the supreme degree of Love. Man is finite love, a lower degree of love. The fundamental fact about the relation of man to the Lord is, that man is a recipient form of love, and as such he receives the Lord's love according to his finite capacity. In this fact lies the deepest and innermost nature of man. Another fact characteristic of man, which makes man to be man, is, that the mode of receiving the Lord's love determines the functions of freedom and rationality. Apart from these functions man would not be a self; he would not feel himself to be a self. Here is where a critical and fatal alternative lies: to feel one's self to be a self, is a quality or property of freedom and rationality, without which man would not be man; but to take this feeling as the reality in the sense that the self is original and independent, is to pervert the feeling, and to convert man into a monster; whereas to preserve one's true manhood one must know and acknowledge that the feeling of being one's self is God-given. It is this alternative that dis-

tinguishes the perverted natural man from the real and true spiritual man. All the radical individualistic and naturalistic philosophies grow out of self-assertion,—the assertion that man is independent and self-sufficient, that he is the final arbiter of good and evil, and that his own nature determines his destiny, there being no higher sustaining and directing power. All the re-actionary forces referred to above have their source in this perverted philosophy. The problem therefore at this stage is, first, to disabuse one's self of this philosophy, next to exorcize the re-actionary spirit and habit, and then to cultivate the philosophy of love and what is involved in it,—the spirit and habit of appropriating tradition as well as the achievements of today. This is one way of stating the whole problem, not only the problem of the young people, but the problem of all men, young and old.

Our New-Church young people are facing this problem; but the problem for them contains some specific features. The re-actionary spirit is not peculiar to the New Church of the present day, nor to our young people of today. From the very beginning there was a re-action against the claim that the New Church is a definite, distinct, and separate organization. Some of the earliest believers in the New-Church doctrines maintained that there should be no separate organization; that those who get a knowledge of the doctrines should work within the bodies of which they find themselves a part, and thus leaven the whole. There have been advocates of this position and method all down through the history of the Church. Another form of re-action against the claim that the New Church is a definite, distinct, and separate organization, is the view that the real New Church is a pervasive influence affecting all men in all the denominations, and by implication in all religions. This position also has been held throughout the history of the Church. This is not the occasion to discuss these positions, but only to point out that they are re-actionary movements; that is, re-actions against the specific claims of the organized Church. All of our members are more or less exposed to these re-actionary influences, which have the subtle and powerful support of our worldly and social interests.

There are also special forms of re-action against Swedenborg. Many New-Church people are offended when they hear his name pronounced in public. They feel that it arouses prejudice and opposition and therefore should be avoided. Reference to Swedenborg in public should be made under the requirements of tact, good taste and good judgment. We should be as free to refer to Swedenborg as to Plato, or Leibniz, or Royce; but we should be careful to make the reference in a way and in a context to convey information and intelligence. Then there is the re-action against Swedenborg's language, his terminology. This is a part of the re-action against Scholasticism, against its method and its vocabulary,—a re-action which has been propagated from the partially educated seventeenth century scientists. In both cases it goes back to a difficulty. The language of Scholasticism was one of the most highly developed instruments of human expression that was ever constructed; and being so complete it was difficult to master it. Swedenborg wrote a very simple and direct form of Scholastic Latin. His vocabulary is difficult, because the meaning is deep and comprehensive. His language, like that of Scholasticism, is the language of common sense, but highly developed common sense. It is for this reason that a serious reading of Swedenborg gives extraordinary satisfaction and immense stimulus so long as we rest in general ideas; but when we try to think out the meaning in definite terms, and in application to definite situations, we meet the inevitable difficulties of complicated thinking and complicated experience. It is this difficulty that has been the perennial source of the re-action against the reading of Swedenborg and against the use of his terms in public address. It is a matter of great importance that the public should be familiarized with Swedenborg's language; but this is not enough; the public should also be familiarized with his meaning. But we have made too little progress in getting the meaning for ourselves, and consequently we have failed to convey the meaning to others. The difficulty of getting and conveying Swedenborg's meaning is responsible for the most serious and pronounced form of the re-action of the present day; namely, the re-action on the part of young and old against a certain type of preaching

and teaching. The complaint is, that our sermons and writings are dry, abstract, uninteresting, and remote from actual life. The explanation is, that we are too prone, because we find it so much easier, to rehearse Swedenborg's language or paraphrases of it, rather than to do the necessary work to get the meaning, and to convey it in language of our own experience and of that of others.

This is the young people's problem. They are facing opportunities for education which are for the most part past and gone for the older people. In spite of all the re-actionary influences to which our young people are exposed, they are something more than re-actionaries. They are striving to get more knowledge of themselves and of life,—life in the Church and life outside the Church; they are thinking with the ideas and principles they have gained in their educational and social environment; and they are in earnest about their own progress and the progress of the Church. They need to rise superior to the re-actionary spirit, and throw off re-actionary influences, and so leave themselves free to devote themselves to appropriating, and to positive and progressive effort. In this they can be helped by kindly advice and by enlightened criticism. The older people are deeply in earnest to give them all the sympathy, encouragement, and help they are able to give. We all need to make more effort in the spirit of co-operation. The final statement of the problem of young people is, that it is the problem of education and regeneration.

Lewis F. Hite.

THE EDUCATED MAN AND THE NEW CHURCH

The man who has religious positions to present which are precious and plain to him is sometimes tempted to think that people withhold acceptance not because of thoughtfulness but because of ignorance or prejudice or for any cause except enlightenment.

We read some two years ago in a leading Unitarian periodical an article entitled, "Why are not all educated persons Unitarians?" This struck us as a rather breath-taking question.

Think of the inveterate differences in mental habit in Orient and Occident, the all-embracing influences of history, the endless variety of human needs in things of the spirit, and then contemplate an attempted reduction of religion to one recent Western form of it in a single world-religion, or ponder the implication that there is or should be no real obstacle to the espousal by every thinking person of this one form of religious thought and interest—and one feels cause for astonishment.

Any form, at all far-reaching or deep-going, of religious thought presents difficulties to those who hear of it for the first time. Christianity itself, and as a whole, began exceedingly slowly, and when it went faster, it also turned less Christlike, suffered easy and weakening adaptations, and admitted elements of paganism. The calm or the puzzled query why all educated persons are not adherents of one's own church or form of religious thought and life is astonishing, therefore, on a second account,—the blindness it implies to difficulties and problems which must be dealt with if one is going to present one's way of thinking and the good of one's religion to the educated man. Only when we, for example, know why an educated man hesitates over the message of the New Church, can we do much to interest him.

We supposed that the article itself might remove the causes for astonishment which its title conveyed. But the difficulties with Unitarianism which it rehearsed were such as may be laid to the power of heredity and environment, as these tend to hold one in the religion in which he grew up, to conservatism, to respect for the prestige of older forms of the Christian faith, to the ability of the educated person to hold his education away from his religious interests, to the loyalty one feels to one's spiritual home, etc. These answers were more astonishing than the question, because they included not a word about reasonable difficulties which thoughtfulness might have with the faith which was being proposed. Surely the man whose education extends to the four Gospels finds elements in the character of the Christ as there portrayed, to which justice is not done in a view of Him as the best of men.

Do we not want to be aware of the difficulties which an educated man has with the faith which we may be urging on his attention? It is a tribute to the strength of our own convictions and to the satisfaction which we take in our faith and church to ask with some puzzlement why all thinking folks do not espouse the same faith. But is it a tribute to our knowledge of the other man? Or to the extensiveness and variety of the Christian faith in its entire manifestation? Is it even a tribute to the understanding we have of the profundities and heights of our own faith? To our understanding of our missionary task? To our understanding of the problems which our form of faith meets? Suppose it meets them successfully, or can do so, still they are there. Why be oblivious to them?

Is it anything but gain for the expositor of a faith to sit down and think carefully why another man, with education and enlightenment, finds it difficult to see that faith as he himself does? That is precisely what he must study if he is to speak with skill and effectiveness to his man.

It is one feature of the message of the New Church that in the Word of God there is a deeper sense or spiritual meaning, beyond the meaning which the Scriptures have always had for men. This idea, which is a precious conviction with us, meets difficulties, as we all know. It meets difficulties which surround the idea itself.

It is only fair to say first that we make some difficulties for ourselves on this head. We try to get attention for a "knowledge of correspondences without which," we say, "the Word cannot be understood." The world understands the Bible, however, without this knowledge, and in such a way as to get from it truth which is far ahead of civilization's progress. What we mean is that without this knowledge the Word cannot be understood in one of its senses—the spiritual sense. It is an added significance, which we are trying to advance, not the only significance or understanding of the Word. Sometimes we say that only the spiritual sense solves the contradictions of Scripture; actually it leaves them standing where alone they occur, in the plainer meaning of Scripture. They are solved well and

helpfully, moreover, in a grasp of the progressive nature of revelation. We are likely to speak of the Word's "mere letter." But the man whose education extends to Scripture is aware of a rich volume of meaning in Scripture as it stands and reads. We speak of a sealed book, but this rich volume of meaning is available on reading and on study. All too often we ask others to entertain the thought of a deeper meaning of which they can make no verification (so they think, at least) while we deny obvious aspects of the Bible, or the established results of modern Bible study, of which they have verification. In many ways we create difficulties in the path of an idea which has difficulty enough attaching to it.

But consider the difficulties which start up of themselves in the path of the idea. The man of any education, whose inquiries have extended even superficially into the field of Bible interpretation, knows how often and for how long expositors have pursued mystic senses in Scripture, and have swept the actual Bible away in a haze of fancied deeper meanings. They rightly want no more of this practice. Are they not right in stopping to be assured that they are not being led into this kind of thing? Their difficulty is not only enlightened, but reverent. They do not care to take for Word of God, and for deeper Word of God, some expositor's conjectures.

The difficulty seems to us to be dealt with, first, by extending to it the frankest and most genuine sympathy.

Secondly, we have to distinguish between Swedenborg's deeper sense and the allegorical meanings attached to Scripture from Old Testament days onward by the whole school of allegorical interpreters. Our practice has been to cite this past conjecture and interpretation as witness for a deeper meaning. This means to the educated man, for whom the allegorical approach is discredited, that his objection is well taken. We need to keep allegorical interpretation and the spiritual sense from confusion in his mind.

It may be that a third step in meeting the difficulty is a display of valid method by the use of which a deeper meaning is consistently and tenably reached. But in all probability the third

step is the *employment* by us of valid method. If the actual deeper meaning can be presented, then its spirituality, its deep helpfulness in the spirit's inner life, its power to make the Lord live to the soul, will persuade the hearer that it is no conjecture but the deeper content, indeed, of the Word of God. In professing interpretation of it, we cannot afford to give our fancies rein. We need to pursue precise and verifiable methods of exposition, and really enter upon the Word's deeper content. It is easier to engage in symbolizing which is fascinating, perhaps, and full of novelty, but which after all is as much a play of fancy as any allegorist ever indulged in, rather than penetrate—with labor, and methodical study, and living insight—into the veritable deeper sense of Scripture, which is a definite content, and which, if reached, has all the power and self-evidencing character of the Word of God.

William F. Wunsch.

THE MIND OF THE NEW CHURCH

It stands to reason that a prevailing habit of mind in a religious body is more conspicuous than any one thing this body of people may have to say. Indeed, any position which it takes and urges will really vary, as the mind advancing the position is narrowly interested in the position or broadly, as the mind is an inquiring one or obviously a closed mind, as it is tolerant or intolerant, as it appreciates that beyond theology lies religion, or as it makes more of theology than of religion, or even confines itself to the former. In accordance with these more vital matters of spirit and habit of mind, the appeal, which the view advanced will have, will also vary.

One of the glories of the teaching of the New Church is that it breathes a large, tolerant and inquiring spirit. To make it sound as though it came swinging the big stick of authority right and left, beating the mind down into assent to it, is to do it fearful injustice.

We think, for instance, of the opening paragraphs of "The Doctrine of Faith." Faith has too often been thrown into

opposition to reason, or to an understanding grasp of a subject. It has been made out to be belief in what cannot be brought under comprehension. Boldly this treatise starts out with the proposition that the realities of the spirit are open to understanding. They can be comprehended. And it goes on to insist that there is no genuine faith except where there is a measure of understanding. One cannot really put reliance in the not-understood. And to make this as plain as possible there is a picture of a dogmatizer addressing some angels in the peremptory tone of such a one, and being met by the query who he thinks he is. The angels themselves protest that they are not called upon to put credence in what they do not grasp at all.

"Do you consider yourself the Deity that I am bound to believe you? or do you think me mad enough to believe a statement in which I do not see the truth? Cause me to see it."

The wisdom of the angels consists solely in this: that they see and apprehend everything they think about.

Real faith is nothing else than an acknowledgment that a thing is so because it is true.

A common remark is that no one can comprehend spiritual or theological matters because they are supernatural. Spiritual truths, however, can be comprehended just as well as natural.

All these statements are from the opening paragraphs of the "Doctrine of Faith." They breathe that spirit of inquiry into truth and of thoughtful and informed faith which is condensed into the slogan "Nunc Licet," in "True Christian Religion." That great summary of the teaching of the New Church criticizes sharply the traditional habit of subjecting the understanding to faith. It can hardly be believed that the Theological Works will anywhere contradict this position and attitude, or retract in any way these great words.

A much quoted passage in the "Arcana" is sometimes taken to say something different. In addition to our quotations above, the "Doctrine of Faith" declares:

"I do not know whether this is true, and therefore as yet I do not believe it. How can I believe what I do not intellectually comprehend? Perhaps it is false."

But "Arcana," n. 129, says among other things,

He who assumes as a principle that nothing is to be believed until it is seen and understood, can never believe, for spiritual and celestial things cannot be seen with the eyes, or conceived by the imagination.

This is the nearest to seeming conflict of statements. "Faith" seems to say that the way of faith is understanding, and the "Arcana" that faith cannot and must not stop for understanding. What would give better warrant, then, than the "Arcana" passage for all the dogmatizing one might care to do? Have we not heard the passage quoted sometimes to support dogmatizing on the basis of a statement in Word or Theological Works? We must start from the Word, and take up our position there—apparently, if the dogmatizer is right, on mere statements of Bible or Doctrine.

If one will read nn. 126-130 carefuly, it becomes plain, we think, that the "Arcana" is not really contradicting what the "Doctrine of Faith" says with such crystal clearness. It is, in fact, saying much the same thing. It is explaining at some length how alone one can exercise the understanding which makes for real faith. It is things of the spirit which we are seeking to grasp. This, the "Arcana" says, we cannot do by tying our mental processes to what we can see, or to data of information—"things of sense," "things of memory," are its phrases. The worldly and the corporeal man is the man who attempts to do this. He will never make his way to belief. Suppose he canvasses the question of human survival after death. What do his senses tell him? That with the death of the body the human being is gone, too. What does information gathered from observation and history tell him? Nothing about the fact of the spirit's continuance in life, at any rate. There is no thoroughfare into truth about things of the spirit by these low avenues. "He is desirous of being instructed in things celestial and Divine from things of sense, which is as impossible as it is for a camel to go through the eye of a needle." Suppose he raises the question whether there is a God who cares. He reduces his inquiry to a contemplation of observable fact, nature's indifference to morality, the unfeeling consumption by one natural creature of another on land or in the sea, etc. By marshalling facts pro and con, by consulting sense-impressions

and judgments, no one makes his way into a knowledge of spiritual realities. That is so obvious.

But is the alternative to this an unthinking acceptance of any statements whatsoever? When the "Arcana" says that the true order of thought is for a man to be wise from the Lord, i.e., from the Word, does that mean that he must unquestioningly take his stand on a mere statement of Word or Theological Works, and give heed only to such facts as uphold the statement? Is that an enlightened mental process? The Word, for example, *says* God is wroth, commands the death of enemies, etc. The eye meets impossibly literal statements about hell-fire. Is not this way of proceeding, as a matter of fact, an effort still to enter on knowledge about unseen realities from what sense gives us, and from what outward knowledge affords —for the eye picks up statements, and any memory can possess itself of what the Word and the Theological Works *say*. The mind must launch itself by higher powers than these.

What the "Arcana" is arguing for is not disregard of the powers of understanding. It wants them exercised for faith's sake. It wants them exercised not to adopt statements but to grasp principles. Especially does it want the highest and not only the lowest powers exercised. If we take up the question of immortality, let us look, not with the eye on the body's fate (we are not asking about the body), but with the understanding at the spirit of man. What is his spirit like? Has it any power to make itself at home in the eternal? Is it something in itself? Has it a world of its own? With light from any Word of God on these inquiries let us pursue them, and pursue them as understandingly as we can, pressing our questions as honestly and hard as may be. Is there a God who cares? Why leave the question to what the senses and the knowledge which builds on observation can tell us? God is unseen, and His care is bound to surprise us and to be hidden from us in large part—except as we try His guidance, and find him looking after us. Let us start with considerations which lie in the same field with the reality of the spirit about which we are asking. We make no headway when we leave questions about the things of the spirit

to knowledge of the observable, or to the testimony of the senses.

The "Arcana" is pointing out a way of inquiry, not discouraging inquiry and recommending dogmatizing on the basis of statements wheresoever made. Go not by sight, but by insight, and inquire in these things, and be understanding in them, if you would have faith, and not blind belief, is the uniform counsel of the teaching of the New Church.

William F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

"AND YET WITHOUT SIN"

The Gospels record surprisingly few instances of the temptations of our Lord. And because so little is said openly of His temptations, it has sometimes been supposed that His temptations were few and far apart. Indeed, thoughtless readers might even suppose that the instances thus mentioned were the only occasions when He suffered temptations.

On the other hand, when one recalls the purpose of His life in the world—namely, to become the Redeemer and Savior of mankind—it becomes obvious that, if He could be tempted at all by the forces that enslaved the world, He must be tempted not only desperately but incessantly by them, until they were overcome. And inasmuch as they were not fully overcome until He could say, upon the cross, "It is finished," it must follow that His whole life here was engaged in temptation-combats. This certainly is implied by Paul in the declaration: "He was tempted in all points like as we are; yet without sin." For how could He be tempted "like as we are," without being tempted all through life?—that is, if we are spiritually growing, because the life of regeneration is accomplished through successively "overcoming." This view of His inner life is more than confirmed when we reflect upon what is involved in His insistent teachings that the Law and Prophets and the Psalms were a "testimony" throughout of Him. For they are a constant record of conflict; and by means of the Divine provision of representation and symbol and type, whereby external things picture forth inward things—as He pointed out, and as the Apostles afterward showed,—the temptations of the leading Bible characters, and all the wars and battles of the Lord's people, were in their deepest signification pictures of temptation-battles that He must wage against corresponding enemies on

the spiritual plane. For, were not all these represented as battles of Jehovah for and through His people, against their enemies? That He did not compass all these in His life on earth is evident from the way He was identified with the Word: first, from the fact that He was the Word "made flesh"—the Word, that is, lived out in Person, compassed in a Person; and second, from His explicit declarations that the Word throughout did "testify" of Him; and third, from His assertion that He had come "to fulfill" the Law and the Prophets. We have, for example, in the description of Abraham pleading for Sodom and Gomorrah, a representative description of the Lord agonizing over the desperate and all but hopeless condition of humanity. These stories of our Lord's inner struggles are here in amazing abundance and in much detail, lying just beneath the letter of the Old Testament, and available for our information and inspiration when we come to the knowledge of the spiritual sense, through the law of correspondences. This is reason enough for their not having to be told in the letter of the New Testament. In fact, their extent was such that they could not be told in fulness in the letter of the New Testament, or in the letter of any testament: the only way they could be told was by the condensed method of representation and symbol and parable, whereby a single brief word-picture (sometimes contained in one lone word) may contain a volume of revelation.

If we would have in mind the inner experiences of our Lord in contact with the powers of evil and falsity in the the realms unseen by men, the closing words of John's Gospel would be literally true, namely: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Therefore the temptations that are openly described must be taken as representatives of types or classes of temptations endured by Him, rather than as the whole literal substance of them. And with this point of view, let us turn to the three designated temptations in the setting of "forty days in the wilderness."

The "wilderness" itself is a symbol of that barrenness and

desolation of the spirit characteristic of temptation. The children of Israel's wanderings in pursuit of the Holy Land of Promise were thus set "in the wilderness." And the number "forty" was the measure there, as it was in the described temptations of the Lord. And so it is throughout the Bible, the number forty is repeatedly used as the measure of a full testing-time of temptation. So, for example, in the story of the Flood. It rained forty days and nights; and the flood was forty days upon the earth. It is a parable-number used in respect to temptation, indicating that it is searching, and that it is full. The time-element is not its message; temptation's measure is its message. The days or the years sink into unimportance, relatively. What is signified by the "forty" here, is that the Lord's temptations were searching, were full, and were complete. The severity of them is forcefully expressed in the Gospel declaration that He "was with the wild beasts"—the wild beasts, of course, of the "beastly" wildnesses and ferocity in human nature, which by ages of well-nigh universal surrender to it, had given the beasts in man dominion over the man in him, and had brought the whole human race to the brink of complete annihilation of the distinctive manhood with which it was in the beginning endowed—and for the restoration of which the Lord had come into the world, Himself clothed upon with an outer nature derived from this perverted human nature.

It was through this human nature from the fallen race, that He was exposed to the ferocity of all the hells that had accumulated from the race, and that at that time had the race almost completely in their hands. The Gospels bear frequent testimony to the fact that "evil spirits" knew Him, even though men might not; and how often they besought Him to leave them alone, when He was about to deliver some poor human wreckage from their grasp! It is the burning desire of the hells to destroy all true humanity in men, and reduce the earth to a hell.

It was only by means of His own overcoming of them, that He was able ever to deliver men from them. And, save for the combat with them, how could He have defeated them? And their name, confessedly, was "Legion."

Now turn back to the scene of these three representative temptations of "the wilderness."

The first one is the sequel to His hunger after the forty days of fasting. The temptation is, to use His Divine power to make bread out of the wilderness stones, and to satisfy His hunger by that artificial, but short-cut, way.

The second one, as given in *Matthew*, is the sequel to a visit to the Temple. It is to cast Himself down from its heights, to prove that He had power to defy the laws of natural gravity, to which men are subject,—a senseless test of His Divinity.

The third one was afforded by His presence on an exceedingly high mountain. There He saw, in panorama, "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," and saw them promised to Him, then and there, if He would only "fall down and worship the Devil" (the personification of all evil). This appeared to be a temptation to become the temporal king of the world, rather than its spiritual King; it was to use His power, certainly, to rule naturally instead of waiting the age-long road of patience required to rule spiritually, in the world.

Now I want, with you, to lift this whole story to the level of a parable, that is, into its representative values.

When our Lord hungered, what did He hunger for, in the supreme sense? He elsewhere declared, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me." And what was that, but to "save His people from their sins"? His great hunger, His supreme hunger, was to save the human race. His fasting may well be understood as a time in which He was in a measure of obscurity respecting how it could be done, or if it could be done at all. The realization of His mission, the vision of the call, and of the Father's commission, had been pictured clearly in the signs accompanying His baptism, which are described immediately before the record of the fasting. The two are thus intimately connected by saying, "Then was Jesus immediately led up of the spirit, into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil."

In order to appreciate the real inwardness of His temptations at all, we must see Him as the embodiment of the love of the

salvation of the human race,—yea, as the Divine love for the souls of men; we must reflect on what is involved in the significance of His name, meaning as it does, "Jehovah saves," for so we can see nothing less in Him than exactly that,—*Jehovah saving His people* from their sins. Therefore, every temptation which He could have, would have as its object an attack upon this great Love; and its object would be to thwart Him in the mission of accomplishing the works of this Love.

I submit to you the thought which men too seldom have reflected upon in thinking of our Lord's temptations, namely, that any mere man who is wholeheartedly devoted to a great cause, knows that his deepest joys are those that see that cause furthered, and his deepest hurts are those that see it hindered. Upon that ground, I hold that we should look upon it as belittling to the name of the Savior of the world to let our thoughts rest in any interpretation of His temptations which would make His own physical sufferings the paramount issue, or even of great significance to Him. When we find Him "an hungered," to the extent that it is allotted a place as one of three outstanding temptations endured by Him, we must think of it (in the real significance) as hunger for men's salvation,—hunger, if you please, for the love of men, hunger to have them turn to Him with their hearts and their lives,—in order that He may only have the chance to give them the blessing, the blessedness, in life for which they were created.

And accordingly His fasting, on its highest plane, had been a period of full realization of the desperate difficulty, the seeming hopelessness of the task. Yet He had the vision, the knowledge, the commission, that put it all in His hands. He fought it out, over the apparent impossibility of its ever being done,—until the urge of hunger came over Him to go forward into its accomplishment.

And at that point the temptation was to get results, in spite of all obstacles. But since the state of men was so low that they were not interested in what He had to give (they had no hunger for it), His temptation was to accept this lower wilderness standard, and offer them a lower good that they

would accept; why not lower the standard of salvation? For, if He should agree to call stones bread, would not that make them so, if He were actually the incarnation of God? Stones, as contrasted with the "words of God," represent truths on the most external plane (and when they are *wilderness stones*, they are those truths in a state of marked obscurity); while the words of God represent truths in the highest spiritual and celestial planes, and in the light and authority and absolute wisdom of the Creator. Natural men make the former to be their bread; and especially so did the Jewish Church to which His immediate mission was addressed, by "making the Word of God of none effect, by their traditions," "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." If He would only condescend to accept this perverted standard, and adopt humanity's deformed pattern as God's own (and could He not, by decreeing it, establish this as the full measure of all that ever was to be expected of men, and make it man's measure?), if He would accept this and decree it, then indeed might the salvation of men go forward and the Divine hunger begin to be satisfied. But the tempter did not succeed with Him. Yet with how many among men he does succeed in this temptation,—especially so with parents,—as he gets them to place their disappointing child in the high niche of their ideal child, and insist that his glaring imperfections are perfections nevertheless! How easy with men it is to accept a lower standard and be satisfied! And even to forget that there had been a higher standard! Oh, it is so much easier than to wait, and endure indefinitely the heart-hunger for the ideal to come,—and helplessly see it postponed indefinitely,—and yet to wait? But the answer of our Lord to the temptation was, "It is written"! It is written in the eternal order of the universe and of man's nature and God's plan and purpose. It is written that "man shall live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." In short, the words of God in His written revelation, are the utterances of the laws according to which the human universe moves onward; it must go upward, not downward, else all would come to chaos: "It is written." The ideal, the standard, is fixed.

Not once, nor twice, but repeatedly our Lord had to meet this class of temptations,—the urge to accept a lower standard, and call that "salvation,"—to proclaim it "the goal."

So with the other temptations,—they were representative of classes. The one to cast Himself down from the wing of the temple was, to rely upon the promises of the Word alone, and unaided, to bear Him up, against failure in His mission. It was a temptation to make *teaching* the sum total of His business. The argument of the hells in favor of this was supported by the argument that He had already used recourse to the Word as written, with such success; He had said "It is written," and evil had been defeated. Then, why not rely upon that, henceforward, wholly? Why bother with the fight in His Person, against the hells? Why go through that agony of actual combat? Why not simply utter the words against them, and teach man against them? Why Himself actually conquer them?

What a subtle plea the hells were thus making for themselves, in seeming to plead for Him! How far they would advance toward final triumph, even over God, if they could succeed in getting Him thus to cast Himself down! And the method was, you notice, to use the Word for His defeat, which He had before used for the hells' defeat!

But here, also, the Lord saw the evil of the reputed good that was held out, and used the Word still, saying, "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,"—here openly challenging by acclaiming it as a temptation, and at the same time by defying it with the assertion of Himself as "Jehovah thy God."

Then the temptation of the exceeding high mountain represents a class most grievous of all, namely, a temptation to be worshiped and served by humanity for the sake of Himself instead of for the sake of humanity. If He would do this, He could assuredly have it; for He could compel it. Why not cease from leaving men in freedom to come to Him or to reject Him, and to serve in His kingdom or oppose it; and why not change all this, and compel men? Then He would have "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them"; for surely

He had the power, and all He needed was to apply it! Behold, after His adequate experience of the perverted heart of humanity, and of the age-long refusal of it to be led into His kingdom, behold how high the mountain of the possibility thus held in sight, and how high the emotion of the thought of thus bringing all to consummation in one brief effort! But, behold also, the realization accompanying it, that this was of evil and not of good, of hell and not of Jehovah. It was a thought from the human in Him, and not from the Divine in Him, as of course all His temptations were. He recognizes it thus, as of the devil, which is to say, the universal hells; and His answer meets it accordingly: "Get thee hence, Satan [the personification of all falsity], for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." There is but one way, and that is the way planned of Jehovah in the beginning. Man must be saved in freedom, or all is lost.

"Then the devil leaveth Him; and angels came and ministered unto Him."

If we were to multiply *our* temptations by all the myriads of the numbers of the human race, I suppose we might begin to approach to something like a conception of the severity of His temptations. And yet how often we accept it as if it had been of no moment to Him, and need be of no concern to us!

But let us not forget that it was "for our salvation" that He endured it; for a fulness of life in us, a richness and sweetness and joy of life in us,—this, and growth in this, unto life-eternal. It was for this that He suffered such dire tortures in the conflicts with the man-destroying hosts of the realms infernal. It was for this that He was "with the wild beasts."

And gratitude for that should excite in us allegiance, devotion, worship, consecrated service. EVERETT K. BRAY.

THE SOUL'S "KING OF THE JEWS"

The Wise Men come to Jerusalem to ask of Herod: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. ii. 2.) He is "troubled" by the question, "and all Jerusalem with him." He

inquires of the "chief priests" and scribes of the people, and is told by them truly that if, as the Wise Men say, the Christ is already born, they will find Him, according to prophecy, in Bethlehem.

Have we any of the wisdom of these wise men of old? If we ask the question, spiritually, in the gracious Advent Season in our Jerusalem—our whole Church-idea of things—will our Herod be "troubled" by the question; and will all our Jerusalem be troubled with him, or will it hail the good news with true Christmas Joy?

The Wisdom of the Wise Men at least gave them no question but that the Lord was verily born somewhere in that Holy Land. When they were told from prophecy that it was to be in Bethlehem, they went devotedly to assure themselves that He was born, actually, in the flesh in that blessed little town whose glory we now look back nineteen centuries to catch anew.

Radical and superficial critics of the Gospel story, are full of question about the miraculous event. The Great Spirit over all the Universe, they tell us, cannot be conceived in this childish way. How can we think of Its leaving its mighty station and confining Itself in a single human form on this earth of ours, one of the least in the myriad which our modern science has discovered. The criticism is almost wholly spatial, materialistic. The scientists themselves are today more affirmative. Differently from the generations just preceding ours, they come very near to identifying their First Cause of all things with that "Great Spirit" of savage and superficial imagination, the Church's revealed Personal God.

Now the basic teaching of all religion, especially the Christian, is that the Personal God is the Creator. He is Creator, moreover, not only of all the worlds from the beginning, but also of every bit of new life, human and otherwise, that comes into being in this or any other world. If this wondrous Creator, then, can create by ordinary human birth, through father and mother, for example a Socrates (the great soul-to-be all potentially contained in first initiament and tiny babe), is it inconceivable that He could create a first beginning of His own

Infinite soul, according to the Gospels, by the Virgin Birth? For the merely human father would have made impossible that Soul's ascent, through all the degrees of human life, up to the Divine, back to His reassumption of Supreme Deity. Is it inconceivable that, for the sake of showing, to a world astray, what a true human life should be, He should have allowed this Manifestation of Himself to be born into the human conditions He had created to be "very good," and to grow up thence, through childhood and manhood, as a Perfect Example and Ideal of true Sonship to God? If such mighty spirits as we have known among men, can show themselves in our often meanest fleshly tabernacles and circumstances, is it inconceivable that the Divine Spirit could manifest itself in that Divine Man of those primitive times? More than that; if even one of His myriad worlds was headed for destruction,—so far as concerned the human souls which made it a worthwhile world at all,—is it conceivable that He should have left it to its fate, even though nothing but this unique Manifestation of the true human life for which we were created, could save it? Does the immense size of the Universe, and of universe beyond universe, of which we are now learning, make the Divine Spirit of their Creator any the less great, in love, in mercy, in wisdom, for *man*, still acknowledged to be the crowning work of God's whole Creation?

Let us, then, be wise men with at least this amount of the wisdom of those of old. Let us *know* that the Lord was verily born, then and there, as the Gospels aver. Let us *know* as surely as we know anything; as fully as the record from eye-witnesses can assure us; as surely as the historic development of Christianity, based absolutely upon this Virgin Birth, can prove, and in spite of all superficial or naturalistic criticism whatsoever, that God Himself was indeed born there and then, in our very flesh. And let us know as wisely and acknowledge why. It was all, as we believe, to prove to us, that a true son or daughter of God, an angel in the making, can be born actually in our flesh, or, if you will, in spite of it; in our actual earthly conditions, or again in spite of them; that, with His

help, we can conquer all evil temptations to the contrary, as and because He conquered His much more grievous ones, and all the hells whence they come; in short, that by following His example, in His strength, we can grow into the human beings we were meant to be, as He grew back into the Divine.

How, then, is our Jerusalem of today affected by the Wise Men's question? It is "troubled," as was that of the Jews of old, if our spiritual Jerusalem is like theirs of that degenerate epoch. Here was the Temple. Its inner precincts were kept very distinctively for its own people. No Gentile must pollute them. Recall how Paul was treated when it was supposed that he had taken the Gentile-Christian, Timothy, there! Here only the Jew must worship, and strictly according to his own doctrine. Here Herod would call together "the chief priests and scribes of the people" of that time, and they would tell him just where the Christ was to be born. They knew all about Him. He was to be "of the house and lineage of David," as, indeed, He proved to be, both through His mother, Mary, and His adopted "father" according to the Jewish law, Joseph, the husband of Mary. They should have known that He was to be Jehovah Himself, for their later Prophets had told them so. They did know He was to come in human Form. All this they understood was to come about *when those far, future prophecies should have been at last fulfilled, and their world should be ready for His Coming.*

But the Wise Men arrived and said He was born already! And then Jerusalem was troubled. Why? Because while her people knew all *about* Him, they did not know Him. They could not recognize One coming to "speak in righteousness," that is, in the simplest doing of right; One "mighty to save," not from their outward, supposed enemies of the Roman world, but from "the foes of their own household." Righteousness, personal, every-day right-doing! No; they had their laws, and traditions, and profitable ways of "binding heavy burdens" without over-stepping their law. They would look after all that themselves. Theirs was a pretty good world as it was. They wanted no personal Savior. And so they could not rec-

ognize Him in "the Child born, the Son given," actually, already, now!

Our worship, then,—and all our wonderful teachings about the Divine Humanity,—the Humanity that, we are taught, was glorified in the Holy City;—what does *our* Jerusalem bid us answer to the Wise Men's, "Where is He"? Is He to us mainly a mental, doctrinal Entity? Shall we say, there He is, in our Scriptures, our teachings, our Sunday worship? Can we rather say, Here He is! He is really born, anew, in this new way,—that He has indeed shown us through our Scriptures and our doctrines,—this new way in which we are now proving our love and understanding of life, of the actual folks at home, of the man or woman beside us at the bench, or the counter, in the club, at the sport? Can we point Him out in this new little effort for something really, eternally good, in one we had thought only selfish or worldly? Are we ready to welcome Him there, to nourish and make Him grow there? Does the truth, that that is the main thing He came to earth to urge upon us, "trouble us"; does that seem too much, or too little, or too constant, or too outward, not "spiritual" enough,—a task for *us,* of our New Jerusalem?

Perhaps our Herod interferes? The historical Herod, who knew so well to whom to go for information about the Christ, might just as well, had he wished, have found out, through "the chief priests and scribes," by way of those later prophecies again, that the Messiah was to be a spiritual, not a natural king. How little need he had to be "troubled" by One Who said, Himself, later, "My Kingdom is not of this world"; Who told the people to "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," provided they would also "render unto God the things that are God's." But this type of Herod says, Mine, the world and its doings, to administer according to the standards of our ordinary week-day world. I want no Super-Ruler in my kingdom. Let Him have the Sundays for Church and prayer and thinking and understanding about Church things; but He must not interfere with the doings of the week. That is the troubled Herod; afraid of the new Spiritual King; sure His world is not

yet ready for Him; the Herod who will even try to kill off all beginnings of such new ideas of life, rather than lose his kingship.

The wise, worldly ruler, on the other hand, knows that when the inner, spiritual kingdoms of his people are ruled from within and above, in righteousness, most of the ruling of the outer kingdom is already accomplished. Have we in us this better sort of Herod to whom the Wise Men may put their question? If we have, then, neither our little kingdom of the week's doings, nor its titular king, will be "troubled." He will rather rejoice in the birth of any new, better, more neighborly impulses and ideas he can recognize, in his own daily doings or in those of his neighbors or his times. He is only too thankful to rule under the one, inner, Divine King. He is eager to welcome and help to fuller life any and every projection of His Kingship in this world. With such a prince of our work-a-day world, we pray rather for every day's actual doings, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven."

Be ready, then, to recognize and point proudly to "Him that is born King of the Jews." For the Jews, in their best state, stand, we are taught, for the "celestial Church" of life. For that is the Church founded on Abraham, and that inner love of the Lord that shows itself in daily, faithful obedience; the first Apostolic Church of the earliest Jewish and Gentile Christians; the Church that helps us to live constantly so near the Lord that we do, at once, anything we can feel He suggests.

But this loving, blind obedience is not enough. We need the Lord also as "King," King of the old type, who was both Ruler and Judge. We need our divine King as our Giver of Truth, truth for daily living, the truest ways of doing His will. We need Him to make us understand, see through the actual need, of ourselves or of anyone else for whom we would do the Lord's will, in this and that actual situation.

Then we can give the true answer to the question, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews? In Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the Prophet. . . . Out of thee shall come a Governor who (literally) shall be Shepherd to my

people Israel." A good shepherd guards, leads and pastures the sheep and lambs of the flock. In us and our fellows these include all the less and greater impulses toward our various "uses" of life, our proper "charity," our special ways of proving our neighbor-love. And our Bethlehem, where God was made Man, to dwell in flesh among us, pictures our natural, present life in this world. It was He Himself Who said, moreover, "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil," and our teachings add that it is only through life in the world that we can achieve our full regeneration.

Be ready, then, for that wise question. Let our Jerusalem be to us a Church, not of doctrine only, but of doctrine applied directly to the life. Let our Herod be a wise, worldly ruler under the one Great King of Righteousness. Be not "troubled," but rejoice, in heart and life, when we can answer, from our own experience, the searching question, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews"? "In Bethlehem of Judea"; for thus it is written by the prophet. "For thou Bethlehem in the Land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall be Shepherd to My people Israel."

CHARLES W. HARVEY.

CURRENT LITERATURE

THE DEFEAT OF THE "HIGHER CRITICISM"

The recent decease of Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., (killed in Palestine, August, 1929, during one of the uprisings) makes not inappropriate at this time a few words in recognition of his great service in promoting the inevitable defeat of the "Higher Critics" of the Old Testament. He was for years a distinguished barrister-at-law of Lincoln's Field Inn, London; and his labors in the field of modern Biblical criticism were from the standpoint of a lawyer bringing everything to the test in accordance with the principles of evidence. From the time of the publication of his "Studies in Biblical Law" in 1904, he was recognized as a master mind in that field. He soon became a contributor to, and later an associate editor of, *Bibliotheca Sacra;* and some of the books subsequently published by him—"Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" (1909), "Pentateuchal Studies" (1912), "The Origin of the Pentateuch" (1912)—were made up mostly of matter that had previously appeared in the pages of that periodical. His more recent works bear such titles as "The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism," and "Early Hebrew History, and Other Studies"; and at the time of his death he was writing a history of ancient Israel and Judah. In an appreciative letter, sent to the *New York Times* just after news of Wiener's death had reached this country, Mr. Wm. Phillips Hall, President of the American Tract Society, and Vice-President of the American Bible Society, said of him:

> Mr. Wiener was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a lover of his own people and of his fellow-men, "an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile". He was one of the most eminent Bible scholars in the world. His knowledge of the ancient manuscripts and versions of the Holy Scriptures was most extraordinary, and his work in the textual criticism of the ancient

Scriptures with a view to the recovery of their original readings was, and is, of monumental importance.

The writings of Mr. Wiener are not as well known as they deserve to be, and perhaps as they will be later on when the retreating "Higher Critics" disappear more completely from sight. Hitherto he has been one of those contending against the current of popularity, a current concerning which in 1911 he spoke from experience as follows:

> I find that the Wellhausen theories are supported by a large number of professors in various parts of the world, who have enormous power by virtue of their positions, the number of their supporters, and the extent to which they and their supporters control the general and technical press. That power is used with the utmost unscrupulousness to prevent any opponent of theirs from getting a fair hearing, and to induce their pupils and the general public to believe that their theories are unchallengeably true. (Pentateuchal Studies, p. 119.)

As an opponent of the "Higher Critics", Wiener has not yet had a fair hearing; but we can assure anybody whose faith in the integrity of the Bible has been shaken by the "Higher Critics", and who desires to have that faith restored, that if he will but read the works of Harold M. Wiener, he will be rewarded in the way desired, and he will be filled with amazement that the "Higher Criticism" ever claimed the affirmative attention of scholarly minds.

Though Wiener lived in London, a large part of his critical essays first appeared in America. The works by other authors that we are about to notice are all American productions, though the first is made up largely of translations from German sources, representing the emphatic rejection of the conclusions of the "Higher Critical" school in Germany by some of her modern scholars.

Through the efforts of Bishop Horace Mellard Du Bose, D.D., (Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, since 1918), a "symposium of reviews of modern critical discussion of Biblical history and doctrine" was published by the Cokesbury Press of Nashville, Tenn., in the form of a dozen pamphlets under the general title, "The Aftermath Series" (1923-1925). Numbers one to nine of the series deal with the Old Testament;

the remaining three, with the New Testament. Those on the Old Testament average about forty-eight pages in length, the pages being numbered consecutively, as if it was intended eventually to publish the series in one volume. As yet they are available only as pamphlets, at twenty-five cents each, or $2.50 for the set.

The term "Aftermath" as applied to the series seems decidedly unfortunate, not only as concealing the nature of the undertaking, but also as not having any very clear application to the critical field. In one of his introductions, Bishop Du Bose, who edits the series, states:

> The purpose of this series is not so much to go into a detailed traversal of the vast inane of the higher critical deductions, as thoroughly to uncover a few of its lines of advance, and show what perilous risks it has taken, and to what completely unsupported ends the hypothesis has been brought. Our wish is to so link up and emphasize the main points in the argument against the higher critical position that they may become intelligible and effective in the hands of the least technical of our readers (p. 49).

While these words are clear enough in themselves, they do not seem to us to make evident the appropriateness of the term "Aftermath"; but we must let that pass.

Viewing the series as a continuous whole, we find the subjects and authors running as follows: (1) The Crisis of Criticism, by Bishop H. M. Du Bose; (2) The History of the Israelitish Priesthood, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (3) The Religious Reformation of Ezra, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (4) Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly? by Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D.; (5) The Integrity of the Old Testament, by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B.; (6) Archaeology versus Wellhausenism, by Prof. Ernest Sellin; (7) Away from Wellhausen, by Martin Kegel, Ph.D.; (8) The Five Books of Moses and the Question of Their Origin, by Max Loehr, D.Th., Ph.D.; (9) The Law and the Prophets, by Bishop Du Bose; (10) The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord, by Prof. John Alfred Faulkner, D.D.; (11) The Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ, by Bishop Du Bose; and (12) The Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bishop Du Bose.

Much stress is laid in these pamphlets upon the fact that the "Higher Criticism" was "made in Germany," and bears every mark of the negative German mind; that it was accepted widely and uncritically in England on the basis of the reputation of Germany for scholarship; and that its English and American advocates, whatever their supposed standing as scholars, having accepted the German teachings uncritically, are really "innocent" of any evil intent. As a class they are simply open to the charge of fundamental unscholarliness. There has been very little independent critical work, of importance and of a negative sort, done by English-speaking students. It all reverberates of Germany. In his pamphlet mentioned above (No. 5), Harold Wiener makes much of the Pan-Germanic charge.

But it is well known that, from the presuppositions of a naturalistic development of history, which denies the possibility of any manifestation of the supernatural in history, in revelation, in miracle, or in any other way, the "Higher Critics" have asserted that Moses was an illiterate leader of the nomadic tribes descended from Jacob; and that they (the critics) make light of the lore of the Egyptians, in which he was reputed to be skilled. Except for unwritten legends and history of a traditional sort, and Mosaic statutes, etc., transmitted orally, they assume that previous to 1000 B. C. the Hebrews had practically no written records or literature; that literature began with the prophets; that the earliest composit code of supposedly Mosaic legislation was imposed upon the people at the time of the Reformation of King Josiah; and that the greater part of Deuteronomy and other portions of the Hexateuch were composed during the Babylonian captivity, and were taken to Jerusalem by Ezra and Nehemiah.

These pamphlets show the invalidity of the above contentions of the "Higher Critics". For instance, the contents of the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen are here shown to furnish indubitable evidence of Egyptian craftsmanship quite adequate to account for everything of that nature found in the Pentateuch; and the clay tablets discovered at Tel-el-Amarna show that in the Mosaic age constant correspondence was going on between

the Egyptian rulers and their provincial governors in Palestine. The efforts of the "Higher Critics" to invalidate the history of the Levitical priesthood are shown by Martin Kegel to be futile. But perhaps the most generally interesting pamphlet of the lot is that by Dr. Wilson in consideration of the question, "Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?"—a question which he answers with an emphatic negative. It is worthy of note that this essay of his has already been translated into a number of foreign tongues. But all the pamphlets of this series are worth reading, though those on New Testament subjects seem at the present time less important than those dealing with the Old Testament.

It is appropriate that we turn now to the recent book by Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Philology, Princeton Theological Seminary, since 1900. But first let us learn something about Dr. Wilson, so that we may judge of his fitness for expressing judgments in the field of Biblical criticism.

Robert Dick Wilson (1856-) prepared for college in the Indiana, Pa., public school, and was ready for the sophomore class at Princeton when he was fourteen years old. However, he did not enter his class—the class of 1876—until [later] . . .

In college young Wilson specialized in language, psychology, and mathematics. In such Bible courses as he then studied, he says that he got "a very low grade of 90, which pulled down my average".

To him language was the gateway into alluring fields that drew him strongly. He prepared himself for college in French, German, and Greek, learned Hebrew by himself, and took a hundred dollar prize in Hebrew when he entered the seminary.

His seminary studies caused him to feel that there was a great need for a type of Biblical scholarship that was not so subjective as much of the teaching he heard, but objective and thorough in dealing with facts that could be known only by exhaustive research over the whole range of the ancient languages related to the Bible. He faced the question seriously,—should he go on in the highly attractive and necessary work of preaching in which he had been so greatly blessed, or was God calling him to years of toil in comparative obscurity and seclusion, in order to let his life count for the defense of the Scriptures on the basis of linguistic and historical facts, which only arduous and patient toil could reveal? He chose under God's guiding hand the life of the scholar, and thousands

have thanked God, and other thousands will yet thank him, that this servant of his said, "Here am I; send me."

What Robert Dick Wilson then believed, and now believes with all his heart, is this: that textual and historical Biblical controversies should be taken out of the region of subjective personal opinion, into the region of objective, clearly attested fact. It was to this task that he set himself, and no labor was to be too long or too tedious or exacting to enable him to reach that goal.

He could not at that time learn Babylonian in America, so he went to Heidelberg, determined to learn every language that would enable him the better to understand the Scriptures, and to make his investigations in original documents.

So to Babylonian he added Ethiopic, Phœnician, all the Aramaic dialects, and Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, and Armenian. He studied in Berlin with Schrader, who was Delitzsch's teacher, called the father of Assyriology. He studied his Arabic and Syriac under Sachau, and Arabic under Jahn and Dieterichi; Hebrew under Dillmann and Strack, and Egyptian under Brugsch. He became conversant with some twenty-six languages in these years devoted to language acquisition.

For Professor Wilson had a plan, carefully worked out during his student days in Germany, under which he proposed to spend fifteen years in language study, fifteen years in Biblical textual study in the light of the findings of his studies in philology, and then, God willing, fifteen years of writing out his findings, so that others might share them with him. And now it is our privilege in this booklet to read, in terms that we all can understand, some of the gloriously reassuring facts that he has found in his long pilgrimage through ancient days.

This sketch was taken from the introduction to Professor Wilson's booklet just mentioned, but it is equally suitable for consideration on turning to his book entitled "A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament"* (1926). It is evident from what is here said, that Dr. Wilson's studies and investigations were prompted by the ominous aspect of "Higher Critical" pronouncements and claims in his early manhood, and that he endeavored to prepare himself for defensive work against the "Higher Critics" on their own grounds. The book before us gives excellent evidence of the competency of his preparation

---

**A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament.* By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1926. 225 pp., 12mo. $2.00.

to handle the subjects involved, and also of the present bankruptcy of the "Higher Criticism".

In the Preface to his book Dr. Wilson states his purpose in the following words:

> I contend that our text of the Old Testament is presumptively correct, that its meaning is on the whole clear and trustworthy, and that we can as theists and Christians conscientiously and reasonably believe that the Old Testament as we have it is what it purports to be, and what Christ and the apostles thought it to be, and what all churches have always declared it to be—the Word of God and the infallible rule of faith and practice.
>
> In the title I use the phrase "Scientific Investigation," because I am trying to judge the Old Testament documents in the light of the facts made known in the documents of the nations who surrounded and influenced the people of Israel through all its history from Abraham to Ezra. Again, I have ventured to use the term "scientific," not merely because these conclusions are based on knowledge, but because, after the introductory pages, I have presented the evidence in an orderly manner, treating of text, grammar, vocabulary, and history in what I consider to be a logical sequence.

In the opening chapter of his book, Dr. Wilson considers the question of "The Method of the Investigation". He begins by calling attention to the fact that there are two methods of proceeding in the case of any person under suspicion of wrongdoing; the first is that of our common law in assuming an accused person to be innocent until proved to be guilty; and the other is that of the inquisition, in assuming an accused person to be guilty until proved to be innocent. The method of the "Higher Critics" in approaching the Old Testament with their minds filled with preconceived theories, is that of the inquisition; the method followed by Dr. Wilson in his upholding of the integrity of the Old Testament, is based upon the traditional belief through the ages, which he maintains to be sound by every principle of evidence, and by his disproof of practically all of the contentions of the "Higher Critics". He gives abundant examples during his treatment of this or that phase of his consideration; and he maintains that "language, subject-matter, and circumstances, all favor the claim of each particu-

lar section [of the books attributed to Moses] to have been what it professes to be" (p. 33).

> In regard to no one of the great *prima facie* marks of genuineness in documents—names, places, dates—have the destructive critics been able to show that the statements of the Pentateuch are false . . . The assured results of scientific criticism, in strict adherence to the law of evidence, is that Moses gave the laws which have his name at the times and places indicated in the documents attributed to him as the mouthpiece of Jehovah. (P. 62.)
>
> It is time for the body of intelligent Christian believers, who are deemed capable of sitting on juries in a court of common law, to assert themselves against these self-styled scholars who would wrest from them the right of private judgment. For in the settlement of this question no special scholarship is involved—no knowledge of Hebrew or philosophy. The English version affords all the facts. The evidence is clear. On the face of it, it is all against the critics. (P. 39.)

After the introductory chapter on method, there are five separate chapters on evidence, dealing respectively with text, grammar, vocabulary, history, and religion, and all showing that the evidence is overwhelmingly against the "Higher Critics".

Turning now to the last book we are to consider at this time, namely, "The Bible Under Fire"*, by John Lorne Campbell, D.D., we find that it is divided into three parts: Part 1, The Higher or Destructive Criticism of the Bible (pp. 3-111); Part 2, Modernism (pp. 115-203); and Part 3, Organic Evolution (pp. 207-285). Dr. Campbell was born in 1849, was ordained into the Baptist ministry in 1868, and has been active in that ministry ever since, holding long pastorates in New York City and in Cambridge, Mass. One judges from his book that in his militant service on the Lord's side he has found the special enemies of the Lord to be (1) the "Higher Critics," (2) the "Modernists" who accept the so-called "assured results" of the "Higher Criticism," and consequently reject Virgin Birth, Miracles, Prophecy, etc., and (3) the "Evolutionists" who dismiss God from His creation. But the part of his treatise

---

**The Bible Under Fire.* By John L. Campbell, D.D. With an Introduction by Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1928. 306 pp., 12mo., illus. $2.50.

that is of importance in our present consideration is the first half, consisting of the six chapters of Part I, and the first two chapters of Part II, wherein is shown the logical effect of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible in leading to the complete infidelity of naturalistic "modernism".

Probably the most important chapters of all in combating the "Higher Criticism" are those entitled "The Critics and Deuteronomy" and "The Critics and the Whole Pentateuch." In these he gives abundant grounds, based upon the internal evidence furnished by the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, for rejecting completely the assertions of the "Higher Critics." For instance, if the Grafian theory were correct, that the writings of the Prophets were actually produced before the Pentateuch, we should not expect to find references to the latter in the former; but, taking up each book of the Prophets in turn, Dr. Campbell shows conclusively that there are abundant references to the Pentateuch in them, thus proving the Grafian theory, and the Wellhausen theory built upon it, wholly erroneous. To anyone who desires to see a concise assembling of such details, together with a summary statement of the case against the "Higher Critics," we do not know a better book to recommend; though the latter half of the book may be found lacking in interest from this standpoint, and the whole, being of a popular nature, is wanting in the thoroughness of a truly scholarly treatment.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND ITS COMPETITORS*

Dr. Angus, author of "The Mystery-Religions and Christianity" (1925), has gathered together a number of sets of lectures delivered before sundry academic audiences in America, into an exceedingly rich and useful volume. The work covers

*_The Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World;_ a study in the historical background of Early Christianity. By S. ANGUS, PH.D., D.LITT., D.D. New York: Scribner's. 1929. 444 pp., 8vo. $4.00.

much the same field as Halliday's "The Pagan Background of Early Christianity" (1925), but is the fuller, more elaborate treatment.

The lectures exhibit a certain diffuseness of treatment which detracts from their effect. The exposition is customarily over copious. The author insists, in the fashion of some 'literary' Liberal Protestant clergymen, upon unloading a platitudinous supply of passages from Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning. He waxes homiletic not infrequently, seldom to happy effect. Obviously not a philosopher, he abandons his role of historical scholar only to utter commonplaces. Dr. Angus is a Liberal Protestant (presumably Low and Broad Anglican), and his particular philosophy of religion suffers (as a front-page review in the London *Times Literary Supplement* for December 26th shows) from a certain naïveté common to Liberal Protestants, especially in his treatment of the Incarnation. He frequently displays party animus toward the Anglo-Catholics, whose sacramental views are characterized, in the language of the infamous Bishop of Birmingham, as "magical." He is violently opposed to anything higher than Zwinglian views of the sacraments, and attacks even Dean Inge (no friend, it need not be said, to the *Church Times* and its school) for distinguishing between the sacraments of the church and the sacramental principle generally. By and large, Dr. Angus admires (and apparently entertains) the Dean's Neo-Platonism.

Angus's task is to exhibit the Græco-Roman preparation for Christianity. Probably no serious contemporary thinker would deny that Pythagoras and Plato and Seneca as well as Moses and Isaiah and the pious rabbis of the Hellenistic period "brought us to Christ." The Epiphany was to the magi and the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. But estimates vary very widely of the extent to which Christianity made use of forms and conceptions and words from the Gentile world. Put in its most extravagant form, it has been maintained that St. Paul made of the minor Jewish sect of the Nazarenes a cult like the "mysteries" of the Græco-Roman world, with its sacraments and its Savior-God. Professor Kirsopp Lake (e.g., "Land-

marks in the History of Early Christianity") takes some such view. There are minimizing views (cf. the study by Nock in "Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation," and especially the brilliant work of Fr. Gavin, "The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments," London 1928). Dr. Angus intends to be moderate and central, though perhaps inclining slightly to the *religionsgeschichtliche* school.

In two important chapters (pp. 92-126) Angus gives us his notion of what was distinctive in the original Christian message, and makes quite clear his dissatisfaction with the course of Christian theology as well as Christian history. He does not attribute the success of Christianity to anything new in its message; it would appear that most contemporary scholars would agree, at least to the extent that some source or parallel may be found to every particular of the system. What was distinctive was Christianity's "historical and personal center in the person of Jesus."

> In the last analysis Jesus was an historical person whose character needed no burnishing, and whose ideals were beyond criticism; but there never was a Mithra, and he never slew the mystic sacramental bull. In the cults of his competitors it was the religion that made the myth and the deity, but it was a Christ who made Christianity, not Christianity who made Christ.

Angus feels no sympathy, however, with the Christianity of Chalcedon: he speaks caustically of a "highly contentious metaphysical Christology concerning a pre-existent descending and ascending Lord." In other words, Angus believes neither in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation nor in Development in the Catholic sense (cf. Newman, "Essay on Development," and Loisy, "The Gospel and the Church"). Origen is the Church Father most after his heart (that is, when Origen is unorthodox, as on the eternity of hell), and Dean Inge among the modern Doctors. In his opinion, the Church effected, in theology, the wrong sort of synthesis with Greek metaphysics. It became Aristotelian rather than Platonic, pseudo-scientific (as Matthew Arnold asserts) rather than flexible and imaginative. In place of "the Greek contention of the amity of the

Divine and the human in all men," it formulated a highly technical "two-nature theory of Christ's person," and limited the union of human and Divine to their junction in a single heroic Galilean.

It is fair to say that the particular point of view from which Angus writes is philosophically and critically inadequate (perhaps antiquated). Every man is a critic, even if *malgré lui*. Dr. Angus does not escape the application of this truth, and, for some, the value of his book will be impaired by its metaphysics. But fortunately for long stretches the author remains the historian; and his research has been so painstaking, his acquaintance with the "literature" of the subject in German, French, and Italian as well as English so exhaustive, and his grasp of his materials so masterly, that we shall wait long for a study of this very important subject so generally admirable.

AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.

Boston University.

"THE PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST IN MODERN CHRISTIANITY"*

John Baillie, M.A., D.Litt. (Edinburgh), the author of the book before us on "The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity", has been Professor of Theology at the Auburn, N. Y., Seminary and at Emmanuel College, Toronto; and he has just accepted the position of Professor of Systematic Theology at the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Still a Scot in make-up, he has undergone some measures of change from study and experience in this newer part of the world.

What is to be expected from Union, the Seminary dreaded by the Fundamentalists of the Protestant Churches, with Dr. Baillie as teacher of theology there? A few lines from the closing chapter of the book before us may help to an answer:

**The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity.* By JOHN BAILLIE, M.A., D.LITT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. 230 pages, 12mo. $2.00.

We indeed believe in the Eternal Father whom no man hath ever seen; and we believe that He was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; and we believe that His Spirit may be present with us, in our individual hearts and also in our meetings with one another. And we also have something of the feeling that, in thinking of the Divine Being, it is well that we should conceive of Him as thus integrating Himself into the manifold of our experience rather than as a bare and abstract Oneness entirely above the manifold of our experience. But to bind ourselves to the number three, and to find in that a special ontologic significance, is a very different matter. We wonder whether we are after all prepared to distinguish between God the Father and God the Spirit in this or in any formal way. . . . We wonder, once more, whether we do not want to believe that it was the Father Himself who came near to us in Jesus of Nazareth—the Father Himself rather than the second person of a Trinity to which the Father also belonged.

There are several statements by Swedenborg concerning the Christian Church as known by him, one of the shortest being in his prologue to the "Canons of the New Church." This reads in part:

The reason that few at this day have religion is: (1) It is not known concerning the Lord that He is the Only God, in Person and Essence, in whom is the Trinity; . . . (2) It is not known that faith is nothing else than truth, and it is not known whether that which they call faith is truth or not; . . . (3) It is not known what charity is, nor what evil and good are; . . . (4) It is not known what eternal life is.

In the "Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church", Swedenborg states the doctrine concerning the Lord in simple form as follows:

There is one God in whom is a Divine Trinity, and He is the Lord Jesus Christ.

He says repeatedly that the teachings of the Christian Church of his day must be dropped before the corresponding truths of the New Church can be seen and accepted. I fancy that John Baillie has been willing, or at any rate able, to drop quite a sensible amount of the old doctrines.

New-Churchmen do not all think alike; they are not all at the same stile on the pilgrimage to the Holy City. Some have not yet reached that on the boundary of the grounds of "Doubting Castle," with its giant. They, as well as other folk,

have some difficult intellectual questions to face, as one finds in our doctrinal classes, and as the preachers find in their studies.

A short time ago the writer handed Baillie's little book, open at the paragraph just quoted, to a minister then under hard strain, as his wife of many years had just been buried. He approved what you have just read. Though its statements may have been clearer than his own had been, they agreed therewith.

There are twelve gates to the Holy City open day and night to men of many sorts—from east, south, west, north.

In one place Baillie says:

> We must look back to Jesus as our Teacher, and must look upon ourselves as His pupils. There are some people who would deprecate such an attempt to regard Jesus in the light of a teacher: but I cannot think that in taking this attitude they are true to the Christian tradition. No reader of the Gospel narratives can fail to see that Jesus was a teacher, first and foremost. Those who followed Him in the days of His flesh all addressed Him simply as "Teacher" and spoke of themselves simply as "pupils." (The Authorized Version says "Master" and "disciple"; but these are only the Elizabethan equivalents for what we now more commonly call "teacher" and "pupil.") (P. 61.)

The New Church generally says "mercy" while others use the word "grace." The point in the next quotation is in the beautiful affirmation concerning the gift of freedom:

> It is God's grace, rather than our faith, that is always the prior fact in the case, our free-will being always undergirded by His indwelling Spirit. (P. 109.)

There is another aspect of the Incarnation to which Baillie gives considerable attention during which he says:

> The Christian announcement is, quite centrally and essentially, that God was made manifest to us in a *Man*, in a soul of like passions with our own, but controlled to finer ends, in a life of simple faith and quiet helpfulness, lived out under human conditions in its own little niche of time and place, and in a cruel death bravely borne. (P. 136.)

In regard to the atonement, Baillie rejects the older ransom theory of a payment to the devil for the release from Hell of mankind, which through the sin of Adam had become his inalienable property. He says:

Though never worked out by any thinker in a thorough-going and systematic way, this extraordinary conception held the almost unchallenged assent of Christendom for a thousand years, until at the end of the eleventh century certain features of it were valiantly attacked by Anselm, the saintly Italian who became Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . For the thought of Christ's death as the payment of a ransom to the devil, Anselm substituted that of it as the payment of a debt to God. . . . Anselm's statement may be taken to represent the strictly traditional doctrine of atonement at its best and clearest. (P. 151.)

A passage on page 182 gives the best idea of Baillie's own thought:

In His great wisdom God knew that nothing could avail to redeem us from our sinful ways but the spectacle of One, in whom was the fulness of His own love, suffering a shameful death as a direct result of His passion to redeem us.

This may be compared with, *Quod hodie non aliud quam suisona ratio amoris instaurabit, quia lapsi sunt—Canones Novæ Ecclesiæ, prologus.*

So we may consider that on the essential acknowledgment concerning the Incarnation, both as to tripersonalism and as to a persistent dualism involved in the terms "Father" and "Son", the incoming Union professor may be welcome.

We now notice a lack in Baillie's position, as it appears to us:

Our doctrines about God are always secondary to our direct finding of God in the realities of our experience, and are never adequate to that finding. (P. 114.)

What is doctrine? Is it better, or truer, than the man to whom it has come? Is it not "the word that I have spoken to you, that shall judge you at the last day?"

He is right if he means, Church doctrines—his Church consensus, or our Church consensus. For it is not what others have settled that concerns each of us directly, but the total that the Lord, as Teacher, has been able to say to any one of us,—to me, to you. Our experience, in the sense of our obedience to conscience, is generally, if not always, behindhand, lacking. So far as we have obeyed, a consciousness is formed with added recognitions, affirmations, fuller, deeper than those that started us. But again there come other dictates of con-

science that ask from us more in the future; and the circle, or spiral, is renewed.

True faith begins, not in our experience, but in our acceptance of the Lord as *Teacher*, the ability to do this being of His gift of freedom. For regeneration is concerned both with truth and life; the parts in us that need to be replaced require knowledge or truth from the Lord to make obedience or faith possible.

But the old Eden contacts had been lost, and direct Divine speech from the Lord was again necessary, coming from the lips of the Lord Jesus, since multiplied by word, by pen, by press, but still, in fact, a direct, Divine message from God manifest in the flesh.

FREDERICK M. BILLINGS.

"THE SUPREME BOOK OF MANKIND"

"The Supreme Book of Mankind,"* by Dr. James K. McClure, D.D., reads like a romance. It is not a collection of unrelated facts and mass of figures, but an interesting story of the part the Bible has played in the development of the English-speaking world, and in consequence to all the nations of the earth.

Dr. McClure shows in the first chapter, "The Coming of the Bible," the supreme importance to mankind of the arrival at Thanet in southern England in 597 A.D. of a band of Benedictine monks from Rome, bearing with them nine books, "The Holy Bible in two volumes; The Psalter; The Four Gospels; A Second Psalter; A Second Copy of the Four Gospels; The Apocryphal Lives of the Apostles; The Lives of the Martyrs; An Exposition of Gospels and Epistles." The influence of these nine books on mankind is the theme of the story. Could these forty monks with the power inherent in

*_The Supreme Book of Mankind:_ An exposition of the change wrought by the coming of "England's First Library." By JAMES K. MCCLURE, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. 216 pp., 12mo. $1.75.

the Bible convert the robust, stubborn people of this island who had been called, "Barbarians," "wolves," "dogs," "whelps from the kennel of barbarism," and make the desert places blossom as the rose?

The second chapter, "The Conversion of the English through the Bible," explains how the attractiveness of three slaves from Britain in the forum at Rome caused Gregory to send Prior Augustine with a company of monks with Bibles as missionaries to England. Centuries afterward Queen Victoria was asked by a subject who was amazed at England's greatness and resources, "Is there any one thing that is the explanation of it all?" She answered, "Yes, there is one thing. It is the Bible."

In chapter three which shows the influence of the Bible upon education, Dr. McClure pays tribute to the "Unknown Teacher," who founded the first school outside the walls of Canterbury where the chief textbook was the Bible. Our author shows that the Bible was the inspiration of the scholarship of the day, and that Oxford and Cambridge started as Bible schools; and he reminds us that the first of our colleges and universities were founded by men trained in the Bible, and were the outcome of "prayer over the Bible, and prayer for Bible continuance,"—Harvard in 1636, William and Mary in 1693, Yale in 1701, Princeton in 1746, Washington and Lee in 1749, Pennsylvania in 1764, Rutgers in 1766, and Dartmouth in 1769. Delayed tribute is also paid to the New England Primer, which was Biblical in character, and of which some 3,000,000 copies were printed.

In the fourth chapter, "The Bible in English Literature," tribute is paid to Caedmon, "the first singer of the English people who put the Bible into verse and sang to it"; to John Wycliffe, who "determined to bring out a Bible in the language of the ordinary man"; to Shakespeare, whose mind "was saturated with the ideals, the thoughts, the characters, and the standards of the Bible"; to Milton, who "breathed the spirit of the Bible as he sang of the birth of Christ and poured out his heart in telling of the hopes, the disappointments and the eventual rewards of life"; to John Bunyan, the master of alle-

gory, who wrote that matchless work, "Pilgrim's Progress," in which "at every turn, there is direct and explicit reference to the Bible as it bears on the experience described"; and to Walter Scott, who said, "There is but one book, the Bible."

In chapter five, on "The Bible and Missions," the author tells the stories of Carey, of Morrison, of Moffat, of Livingstone, of Stanley, and tells them in a thrilling dramatic manner that grips the imagination. There is not a dull line in the book. All New-Church followers will profit from the reading of this book of 216 pages, and will gain a new appreciation of the influence of the Bible upon education, missions, literature, colonization, and civilization.

JEDEDIAH EDGERTON.

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

The regular price for the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is $2.00
and for the NEW-CHURCH LEAGUE JOURNAL is $1.00

WE OFFER
A JOINT SUBSCRIPTION TO BOTH FOR $2.50

provided such joint subscription adds a new name to at least one of the periodicals. Such joint subscription may be addressed either to the LEAGUE JOURNAL or to the

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, 134 Bowdoin St., BOSTON, MASS.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.

Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.

Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.

Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.

Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.

Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.

Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.

Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.

New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.

Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.

San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.

St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.

Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.

Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. I

Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.

Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road. Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President,*
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer,*
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.